STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 337F916
Journal of the proceedings of
0 0001 00364566 8

CLASS S 337 BOOK F916

VOLUME

PENNSYLVANIA
STATE LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/journalofproceed00gene

JOURNAL

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FRIENDS

OF

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY,

IN GENERAL CONVENTION MET

AT THE CITY OF NEW YORK, OCTOBER 26, 1831.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE CONVENTION.

BY HEZEKIAH NILES,
Principal Secretary to the Convention.

Baltimore—1831.

COMMITTEES OF THE CONVENTION.

Several of the committees of the convention were altered or enlarged after the original appointments, as stated in the journal—but the secretary believes that the business referred will be more conveniently attended to, by publishing all the names of such committees at once.

On frauds upon or evasions of the revenue—Messrs. *Schenck*, of New York, Brown, Massachusetts, Allen, Rhode Island, Barr, Maryland, Reeves and Waln, Pennsylvania, Ellsworth and Murray, New York.

On the production and manufacture of iron and steel—Messrs. *Dunlop*, S. Richards, Valentine, Jones, Haldeman, Stewart, Keim, Henry, Pennsylvania, J. Richards, Scott and W. Jackson, N. Jersey, Newell, R. Island, E. T. Ellicott, Boyle, Maryland, B. B. Howell, Murray, Ross, J. Townsend, New York, Holley, Connecticut, Leech, Massachusetts, Phillips, J. R. Coates and Chambers, Pennsylvania, and Hammond, Vermont, J. H. Pierson, New York.

On the production of sugar, &c.—Messrs. *Coxe* and Riddle, of Pennsylvania, Taylor, Maryland, Herttell, New York, White, Massachusetts.

On hats—and cabinet furniture—Messrs. *Crolius*, New York, Darrach and McKee, Pennsylvania, Rodgers, Maryland, Randall, Connecticut, Rankin, New Jersey, Knower, New York, Bates, Massachusetts, Dunn, Pennsylvania, Williams, Maryland, Lord, New Hampshire, Cross, New Jersey.

On cash payments of duties—Messrs *Bunker*, Pennsylvania, Evans, Maryland, A. Lawrence, Massachusetts, Breck, Pennsylvania, Broadhead, Massachusetts, and Paine, New York.

On the production and manufacture of copper—Messrs. *Simpson*, New York, McKim, Maryland, Crocker and Binney, Massachusetts, and Merrick, Pennsylvania.

On the growth of wool—Messrs. Wheeler and Culver, New Hampshire, Cushman and Richards, Vermont, Newton and Merrick, Massachusetts, Wingate, Maine, Irish, Rhode Island, Marshall, Connecticut, Corwin, Beekman, Ives, Richardson, Thompson, Dubois, Cunningham, Carpenter, Livingston, New York, Robeson, New Jersey, *McGiffin*, Wilson, J. Roberts, McIlvaine, Pennsylvania, Kelso, Johnson and Keyser, Maryland.

On the manufacture of wool—Messrs. Pierce, New Hampshire, Paine, Vermont, Shaw, *Robbins*, Tufts, Brown, Massachusetts, Rhodes, Rhode Island, Hinsdale, Trumbull, Connecticut, Schenck, Dexter, Robinson, New York, Morrow, New Jersey, Young, Houston, Pennsylvania, Wethered, Maryland, Pray, Massachusetts.

On the production and manufacture of cotton—Messrs. Wells, Williams, New Hampshire, *Jackson*, Ingerson, Mass Simmons, D' Wolf, Jackson, Rhode Island, Deforrest, Connecticut, Shearman, Hart, Wild, Williams, New York, Collett, Holsman, New Jersey, Brackenridge, Waln, Pennsylvania, O'Donnell, McCulloh, Maryland.

On the subject of chemistry—Messrs. *Tyson*, Keener, Maryland, Parmenter, Massachusetts, E. Roberts and Bakewell, Pennsylvania.

On the culture of silk, hemp, &c.—Messrs. P. A. Brown, R. B. Jones, Leiper, Morgan, Franklin, Engle, Pennsylvania, Watson, Mather, Connecticut, Ruggles, Rhode Island, Pray, Lyman, jr. Massachusetts, *Sanders*, White, Prince, New York, Coryell, New Jersey, Gale, Maryland.

On the currency—Messrs. *T. Ellicott*, Maryland, Knower, New York, A. Lawrence, Massachusetts, T. White, Pennsylvania, McCulloh, Maryland.

Permanent committee—Messrs. *Niles*, Maryland, Carey, Pennsylvania, Dwight, Massachusetts, Dupont, Delaware, Hubbard, Connecticut, Tibbetts, New York, McCulloh, Evans, T. Ellicott, Kennedy, Maryland, Cozzens, Rhode Island, Merrick, Ingersoll, Pennsylvania, Dutton, Brown, Massachusetts, Tallmadge, Schenck, New York.

On the manufacture of paper—Messrs. Seymour, Greele, Craig, New York, Stearns, Massachusetts.

On glass, porcelain and other manufactures of clay—Messrs. *Binney*, Parmenter, Massachusetts, Bakewell, E. Roberts, Pennsylvania, Crolius, New York.

The names of the chairmen of the preceding committees are indicated by being printed in *italics*—as the secretary understood them to have been appointed or selected. And—

Mr. *Ingersoll*, of Pennsylvania, was chairman of the committee on the address to the people—Mr. *Everett*, of Massachusetts, of that to prepare a memorial to congress—Mr. *D'Wolf*, of Rhode Island, of that concerning the effects of the existing tariff—Mr. *Chittenden*, of Vermont, of that on finance, and Mr. *Denny*, of Massachusetts, of that on leather and its manufactures.

It is proper to add, however, that the names of the chairmen were not officially returned—those who presented the reports being so considered, in the absence of more decided indications.

☞ The roll of the members of the convention, so far as they are known to have attended, being annexed to the ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES—it has not been thought necessary to insert them in the journal.

[The APPENDIX referred to will be made up of the reports of the committees.]

JOURNAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

FRIENDS OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRY.

At a meeting of delegates from the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio and the District of Columbia, assembled in the city of New York on Wednesday, the 26th October 1831, for the purpose of taking into consideration what proceedings may be necessary for the support and further extension of the American System, as involved in the protection of the various pursuits of domestic industry,—held in the Hall of the Quarter Sessions, at 10 o'clock A. M.

The convention was called to order by Mr. *Murray*, of New York, and gen. *James Tallmadge*, of New York, appointed chairman—and *Hezekiah Niles*, of Maryland, secretary, *pro tem.*

On motion of Mr. *Shaw*, of Massachusetts, as amended by Mr. *Dwight*, it was—

Resolved,—That a committee of three members from each of the state delegations be nominated by them, to consider and report to the convention the manner of its organization, and nominate suitable persons to fill the offices, for the consideration of the convention.

The following committee was then appointed.

MAINE, ...	Joshua Wingate,
	Isaac Ilsley,
	Josiah Calef.
NEW HAMPSHIRE, . .	Samuel Grant,
	John Williams,
	John B. Wheeler.
VERMONT, ...	Heman Allen,
	Martin Chittenden,
	Charles Paine.
MASSACHUSETTS, . . .	Henry Shaw,
	Samuel Hoar,
	Alexander H. Everett.
RHODE ISLAND, . . .	Charles Eldridge,
	Nathan F. Dixon,
	Zachariah Allen.
CONNECTICUT, . . .	Calvin Goddard,
	Samuel B. Sherwood,
	Samuel D. Hubbard.
NEW YORK, ...	Peter H. Schenck,
	Jesse Buel,
	George Tibbits.

56801

New Jersey,	Joseph Hornblower,
	John N. Simpson,
	Samuel Swan.
Pennsylvania,	Benjamin W. Richards.
	Walter Forward,
	Jonathan Roberts.
Delaware,	E. I. Dupont,
	John Gordon,
	Philip Reybold.
Maryland,	Thomas Ellicott,
	Hezekiah Niles,
	John Brien.
Virginia,	William Lambdin,
	John McLure.
Ohio,	George Endly,
	Holland Green.
District of Columbia,	Peter Force.

Resolved, That the secretary of the convention have a list of the members of this convention prepared, together with the names of their post offices respectively, and the places of their present abode or residence in the city of New York, to be printed for the use of the members.

The committee appointed by the convention to make a report on the manner of its organization, and nominate suitable persons to fill the several offices therein, submitted the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the appointment of a president, four vice presidents and four secretaries, be recommended for the due organization of the convention.

Resolved, That the following gentlemen be unanimously proposed as suitable persons to fill the several offices above designated:

For president	WILLIAM WILKINS, *of Pennsylvania*,
vice presidents,	JOSEPH KENT, *of Maryland*,
	JAMES TALLMADGE, *of New York*,
	GEORGE BLAKE, *of Massachusetts*,
	LEWIS CONDICT, *of New Jersey*,
Secretaries,	HEZEKIAH NILES, *of Maryland*,
	ROBERT TILLOTSON, *of New York*,
	CHARLES PAINE, *of Vermont*,
	JOSHUA W. PIERCE, *of New Hampshire*.

The foregoing report being considered, and the vote taken separately on each of the resolutions, and on the several nominations, they were all unanimously agreed to.

The president was then conducted to the chair by Mr. *Roberts*, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. *Crowninshield*, of Massachusetts—and Messrs. *Tallmadge* and *Blake*, vice presidents, and Messrs. *Niles*, *Paine* and *Pierce*, secretaries, also took their seats.

The following resolutions were then severally offered and agreed to—

Resolved, That the committee of three from each state, already appointed, do consider and report what business may properly come before this convention, and in what order it shall be arranged.

Resolved, That when this convention adjourns, [for the day] it will adjourn to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that the convention meet daily at that hour until otherwise ordered.

Resolved, That the mayor and recorder, and the gentlemen of the board of aldermen, and of the board of assistants, of the city of New York, be invited to take seats on the floor of this convention.

Resolved, That Mr. Redwood Fisher be invited to take a seat within the bar of this convention.

On motion of Mr. J. *Wethered* it was

Resolved, That a portion of the gallery be set aside for the use of ladies.

The convention then adjourned to 4 o'clock P. M.

Wednesday, October 26, 4 o'clock, P. M.

The convention being called to order—it was

Resolved, That the editors of the public papers in the city of New York, and such persons as they may employ as reporters for their respective journals, be furnished with such accommodations as they may need for that purpose, and respectfully invited to publish the proceedings of this convention.

A representation being made—it was

Resolved, That certain gentlemen, late members of the convention of iron manufacturers, just held in the city of Philadelphia, be received as members of this convention.

The convention then adjourned.

Thursday, October 27th, 1831.

The convention being called to order, the following report was presented—

The committee appointed to consider and report what business may properly come before this convention, and in what order it shall be arranged, report in part:

That committees be appointed by the convention for the following purposes, viz:

1*st.* To prepare an address to the people of the United States, affirming the constitutionality and expediency of a tariff, protecting the interests of agriculture, commerce and manufactures.

2*nd.* To enquire and report upon any evasions of the existing revenue laws.

3*rd.* To prepare a memorial to congress enforcing the propriety of continuing the protection of our domestic industry—whatever reduction of duties may be expedient on articles not conflicting with that industry.

4*th.* To enquire and report upon the effect of the existing tariff upon the agriculture, manufactures, mechanic arts, internal trade and foreign commerce, of the country.

JESSE BUEL, *Chairman.*

The foregoing propositions having been separately considered, were adopted by the convention, and the 1st, 3rd and 4th were severally referred to committees consisting of one member from each state—and the 2nd proposition to a committee of seven members.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the foregoing committees be appointed by the president.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That when the convention adjourns, it adjourn to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The convention then adjourned.

Thursday, Oct. 27—4 o'clock P. M,

The convention met, and the president announced the following gentlemen to compose certain committees, as authorised by the resolutions which passed this forenoon viz:

1*st.* To prepare an address to the people:

From Maine,	Mr. Emery,	From New Jersey,	Mr. Hornblower,
N. Hampshire,	Grant,	Pennsylvania,	Ingersoll,
Vermont,	Allen,	Delaware,	Gray,
Massachusetts,	Dutton,	Maryland,	Kennedy,
Rhode Island,	Dixon,	Virginia,	McLure,
Connecticut,	Huhhard,	Ohio,	Endly,
New York,	Kellogg,	Dist. of Columbia,	Force.

2d. Committee—upon evasions of the revenue:

From New York,	Mr. Schenck,	From Maryland,	Mr. Barr,
Massachusetts,	Brown,	Pennsylvania,	B. Reeves,
New York,	Ellsworth,	do	Waln.
Rhode Island,	Allen,		

3d. Committee—to prepare a memorial to congress:

From Maine,	Mr. Wingate,	From New Jersey,	Mr. Darcey,
N. Hampshire,	Rice,	Pennsylvania,	Hemphill,
Vermont,	Richards,	Delaware,	Dupont,
Massachusetts,	Everett,	Maryland,	Tiernan,
Rhode Island,	Cozzens,	Virginia,	Lamhdin,
Connecticut,	Sherwood,	Ohio,	Green.
New York,	Buel,		

4th. Committee—to report upon the effects of the existing tariff:

From Maine,	Mr. Calef,	From New Jersey,	Mr. Wright,
N. Hampshire,	Wells,	Pennsylvania,	Forward,
Vermont,	C. H. Hammond,	Delaware,	Gordon,
Massachusetts,	Henry Shaw,	Maryland,	T. Ellicott,
Rhode Island,	D'Wolf,	Virginia,	McLure,
Connecticut,	Gilman,	Ohio,	Green.*
New York,	C. A. Davis,		

The president, in announcing the foregoing committees, gave notice that he did not intend to indicate the chairmen by placing any particular name first, but had ranged them geographically, leaving it with the committees to appoint their own chairmen, with the exception of the 2d committee.

On motion of Mr. *Brown*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That it he respectfully suggested to the committee appointed to draft an address to the people of the United States, to place before them a plain, clear and comprehensive view of the history of the tariff, or "American System;" with the view of shewing, not only that this system is constitutional, but that it was a part of the plan of our forefathers who brought about our glorious revolution; that it originated anterior to the Declaration of Independence; that a steady attachment to its principles, caused the abrogation of the "act of confederation" and the formation and adoption of the present constitution—that its constitutionality has been legislatively admitted for nearly half a century—during all which time the people have uniformly concurred in this construction.

The following report was then read—

The committee of three from each state, appointed to consider and report the subjects proper for the consideration of this convention, beg leave to report further, in part:

5th. They recommend, that committees he appointed to consider and report on each of the following subjects, viz:

On the production and manufacture of iron:

On the production and manufacture of wool:

On the production and manufacture of cotton:

On the subject of the payment in cash of duties on imports:

On the culture of silk, hemp, and other agricultural materials, used in the manufactures of our country.

6th. That a committee he appointed for the purpose of devising means to defray the expenses of the convention.

JESSE BUEL, *chairman*.

Z. ALLEN, *secretary*.

The foregoing propositions having been separately considered, it was

Resolved, That a committee of fifteen be appointed on the production and manufacture of iron.

That a committee of fifteen be appointed on the growth of wool.

That a committee of fifteen he appointed on the manufacture of wool.

That a committee of fifteen be appointed on the production and manufacture of cotton.

That a committee of seven be appointed on the subject of cash payments of duties.

That a committee of fifteen he appointed on the culture of silk, hemp, and other agricultural materials.

That a committee of one from each state be appointed on the subject of finance.

On motion of Mr. *Carey*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee of one from each state he appointed to report upon the subject of the production and manufacture of leather.

* Mr. Coxe, of Pennsylvania, was afterwards added to this committee.

On motion of Mr. *Wetherill*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to report on the production and manufacture of lead.

On motion of Mr. *Simpson*, of New Jersey, it was.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to report on the production and manufacture of copper.

On motion of Mr. *Bruen*, (delegated by Kanawha county, Virginia,) it was

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to report on the production and manufacture of salt.

On motion of Mr. *Tyson*, of Maryland, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to report on the subject of chemistry, as connected with manufactures and the mechanic arts.

On motion of Mr. *Crolius*, of New York, it was

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed to report upon the subject of the manufacture of hats, and the materials used in the production of the same.

On motion of Mr. *Coxe*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to report upon the subject of the production, manufacture and consumption of sugar and molasses.

The convention then adjourned.

Friday, October 28th, 1831.

The convention met, and the president announced the following gentlemen as composing certain committees, viz:

On the production and manufacture of *iron*.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. Dunlop,	New Jersey,	Mr. Scott,
	S. Richards,	Vermont,	C. H. Hammond,
	Valentine,	New York,	J. Townsend,
	Jones,	Rhode Island,	Newell,
	Halderman,	Maryland,	E. T. Ellicott,
	Stewart,		Boyle,
	Keim,	Connecticut,	J. M. Holley,
	Henry,	Pennsylvania,	J. R. Coates.
New Jersey,	Richards,		

On the production, manufacture and consumption of *sugar*.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. Coxe,	New York,	Mr. Herttell,
	Riddle,	Massachusetts,	White.
Maryland,	Taylor,		

On the production and manufacture of *lead*.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. Wetherill,	New York,	Mr. Phelps.
	Breckenridge,		

On the manufacture of *hats*.

New York,	Mr. Crolius,	Connecticut,	Mr. Randall,
Pennsylvania,	Darrach,	New Jersey,	Rankin,
	McKee,	New York,	Knower.
Maryland,	Rodgers,		

On the subject of *finance*.

Maine,	Mr. Wingate,	New Jersey,	Mr. Jackson,
N. Hampshire,	Gilman,	Pennsylvania,	Hassinger,
Vermont,	Cbittenden,	Delaware,	Kennedy,
Massachusetts,	Crowninshield,	Maryland,	Kelso,
Rhode Island,	C. E. Robbins,	Virginia,	McLure,
Connecticut,	Boardman,	Ohio,	Endly.
New York,	Smith,		

On the subject of *cash payment of duties*.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. Bunker,	Rhode Island,	Mr. Mauran,
Maryland,	Evans,	Massachusetts,	Broadhead,
Massachusetts,	A. Lawrence,	New York,	Paine.
Penn sylvania,	Breck,		

On the production and manufacture of *salt*.

Virginia,	Mr. Bruen,	New York,	Mr. Kellogg.
Pennsylvania,	Stewart,		

On motion of Mr. *Darsey*, of New Jersey, it was

Resolved, That the committee on iron, report also on the manufacture of steel,

On motion of Mr. *Williams*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to report upon the manufacture of the various kinds of cutlery in the United States.

And, on motion, this resolution was referred to the committee on iron.

On motion of Mr. *Smith*, of New Jersey, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to prepare and report a schedule of rates of duties, exacted on the principal exports of the United States in the ports of Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, France and Russia—and the duties levied on some of the staple exports of those nations, when imported into the United States.

Which resolution was committed to

New Jersey,	Mr. Smith,	Pennsylvania,	Mr. Carey.
Maryland,	McCulloh,		

The president then announced the gentlemen composing the committee on the production and manufacture of *copper*.

New York,	Mr. Simpson,	Massachusetts,	Mr. Crocker,
Maryland,	McKim,	do.	Binney,

On motion of Mr. *Brown*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire into and report the state of the coasting and internal trade of the United States, and how far the protection of American manufactures have tended to improve them.

Which resolution was referred to the 4th general committee.

On motion of Mr. *Breck*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That this convention do recommend to our fellow citizens of the western, southwestern and southern states and territories, friendly to the American System, to assemble in conventions for the purpose of expressing to congress, by memorial or otherwise, their sentiments on that very important subject.

On motion of Mr. *Williams*, of New York, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to enquire into the moral influence of our manufactories, upon the persons employed therein, whose duty it shall be to report to this convention the facts, as far as they have been developed by twenty-five years experience.

Which resolution was referred to the 1st. general committee.

On motion of Mr. *Dwight*, of Massachusetts, it was

Resolved, That the members of this convention be requested, as early as possible, to place such information as they may possess, connected with the several branches of trade and industry in the United States, before the several committees to whom these subjects have been respectively referred.

On motion,

Mr. Leach, of Massachusetts, was added to the committee on iron—Mr. Merrick, of Pennsylvania to the committee on copper—and

Mr. Bates, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Dunn, of Pennsylvania, to the committee on hats.

On motion of Mr. *Lord*, of New Hampshire, the committee on hats was directed to report on the subject of cabinet furniture.

And on motion—Mr. Williams, of Maryland, Mr. Lord, of New Hampshire and Mr. Cross, of New Jersey, were added to the committee on hats.

A communication from certain citizens of Ohio, assembled at New Lisbon, was then read.

On motion, Mr. J. M. Holley, of Connecticut, was added to the committee on iron.

The following report was then read—

The committee of three from each state, appointed to consider and report on business expedient to be attended to by this convention, beg leave further to recommend,

7*th.* That a *permanent committee* of correspondence and statistics be appointed, (to communicate with the several state committees hereafter to be provided for), whose duty it shall be to collect and disseminate information from time to time, and as soon as convenient, in relation to the statistics of the United States, concerning agriculture, manufactures and the mechanic arts, as combined with, or united to, the interior and exterior commerce and navigation of our country. Showing as far as possible, the general effects of the protecting system on its population and prosperity, the number of persons employed in the several branches of industry, (designating the sexes and ages), with the average or aggregate of their wages earned, and the value of commodities produced by them—the amount of capital variously invested or employed—and the bearings of the several great branches of productive labor upon one another.

That the aforesaid permanent committee shall appoint the several state committees as they think most expedient, and, generally, arrange the matters submitted to them, that the objects of this convention may be accomplished.

8*th.* That a committee be appointed to report upon the currency of the country as affecting or affected by the "Protecting System."

9*th.* That a committee be appointed to collect and publish information on the culture and preparation for market, of madder, woad, weld, and other vegetable dyes, used in our manufactures.

10*th.* That all reports made to the convention, shall be delivered to the permanent committee; and also that all reports of committees of the convention, not prepared in season to be presented at this time, shall be sent to the said committee to be collated, revised and published by them, at their discretion.

JESSE BUEL, *Chairman.*

On motion, the foregoing report was accepted, and it was ordered that the *permanent committee* consist of seven: that the committee on the *currency* consist of five:—and that the committee on the culture of *vegetable dyes* consist of three.

The president announced the following gentlemen as composing certain committees,—viz:

On the *growth of wool.*

New Hampsbire,	Mr. Wheeler,	New York,	Mr. Beekman,
	Culver,		Ives,
Vermont,	Cushman,		Richardson,
Massachusetts,	Newton,	New Jersey,	Robeson,
	Merrick,	Pennsylvania,	McGiffin,
Rhode Island,	Irish,		Wilson,
Connecticut,	Marshall,		Roberts,
New York,	Corwin,		

On the *manufacture of wool.*

New Hampshire,	Mr. Peirce,	Connecticut,	Mr. Trumbull,
Vermont,	Paine,	New York,	Schenck,
Massachusetts,	Hy. Shaw,		Dexter,
	Robbins,	New Jersey,	Morrow,
	Tufts,	Pennsylvania,	Young,
	Brown,		Houston,
Rhode Island,	Rhodes,	Maryland,	Wethered,
Connecticut,	T. Hinsdale,		

On the production and manufacture of *cotton.*

New Hampsbire,	Mr. Wells,	New York,	Mr. Shearman,
	Williams,		Hart,
Massachusetts,	Jackson,	New Jersey,	Collet,
	Rogerson,		Holsman,
Rhode Island,	Simmons,	Pennsylvania,	Brackenridge,
	D'Wolf,		Waln,
	Jackson,	Maryland,	O'Donnel.
Connecticut,	Deforrest,		

On the production and manufacture of *leather*.

Maine,	Mr. Emery,	New Jersey,	Mr. Shipman,
New Hampshire,	Lefavour,	Pennsylvania,	Howell,
Vermont,	Slason,	Delaware,	Alricks,
Massachusetts,	Denny,	Maryland,	Mathias,
Rhode Island,	Richmond,	Virginia,	Lambdin,
Connecticut,	Hinsdale,	Ohio,	Green,
New York,	Sayre,		

On the subject of *chemistry*.

Maryland,	Mr. Tyson,	Pennsylvania,	Mr. E. Roberts,
	Keener,		Bakewell,
Massachusetts,	Parmenter,		

The convention was then adjourned to 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Saturday, October 29th, 1831.

The convention being called to order, the following report was presented and read.

The committee appointed to prepare a memorial to congress, enforcing the propriety of continuing the protection of our domestic industry—whatever reduction may be expedient on articles not conflicting with that industry; beg leave respectfully to report,

"That, as the basis of the memorial will consist of facts, to be disclosed in other reports to be made to this convention, or to the permanent committee thereof—and as it may be necessary to have regard to other circumstances that may not occur until after the adjournment—they have deemed it their duty to defer the preparation of the memorial until after the rising of the convention: and that they will take such measures for presenting the same to congress at their next session, as may be ordered by the convention. All which is respectfully submitted.

A. H. EVERETT, *Chairman*.

On motion of Mr. *Lyman*, of Massachusetts, the foregoing report was accepted.

The president then announced the following gentlemen as composing certain committees viz:

On the culture of *silk*, *hemp* and other *agricultural* materials.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. P. A. Browne,	Pennsylvania,	Mr. Morgan,
do.	R. B. Jones,	do.	Franklin,
do.	Leiper,	do.	Engle,
Connecticut,	Watson,	Massachusetts,	Pray,
do.	Mather,	New Jersey,	Coryell,
Rhode Island,	Ruggles,	Massachusetts,	T. Lyman, jr.
Maryland,	Gale,	New York.	White,
New York,	Sanders,		

On the culture and preparation for market of *madder*, *woad*, *weld* and other vegetable dyes.

New York,	Mr. Buel,	Massachusetts,	Mr. Tufts.
Rhode Island,	Eldridge,		

On the *currency* as affecting and affected by the protective system.

Maryland,	Mr. T. Ellicott,	Pennsylvania,	Mr. J. White,
New York,	Knower,	Maryland,	McCulloh.
Massachusetts,	A. Lawrence,		

Permanent committee.

Maryland,	Mr. Niles,	Connecticut,	Mr. Hubbard,
Pennsylvania,	Carey,	New York,	Tibbetts,
Massachusetts,	Dwight,	Maryland,	McCulloh.
Delaware,	Dupont,		

The following report was then presented and read—

The committee appointed for the purpose of devising means to defray the expenses of the convention, report: That they have attended to the business of their appointment, and, from the best estimate which they have been able to make, the probable expenses of the convention will amount to about five hundred dollars. To provide for the payment thereof, the committee recommend an assessment of two

dollars upon each member of the convention, to be paid to the secretary, and to be disbursed by him in payment of such expenses; and that the surplus, should there be any, be by him paid over to the chairman of the permanent committee, to be expended under the direction of said committee.

M. CHITTENDEN, *Chairman.*

On motion—the foregoing report was accepted.

On motion—Mr. S. Richards and Mr. Chambers of Pennslylvania, and Messrs. Howell, Murray and W. D. Ross, of New York were added to the committee on iron and steel; and Mr. Pray, of Massachusetts, to the committee on the manufacture of wool.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That when the convention adjourns, it will adjourn to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

The committee on the production, manufacture and consumption of *sugar and molasses* presented a report, which, after having been read, was ordered to be laid on the table.

The convention then adjourned.

Saturday, Oct. 29—4 *o'clock P. M.*

The convention met—

On motion, Mr. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. Thompson, of New York, were added to the committee on the growth of wool.

The following report was then presented and read—

The committee appointed by the convention under the following vote:—"*Resolved*, that a committee of five be appointed to report on the subject of *Chemistry*, as connected with manufactures and the mechanic arts," have considered the subject referred to them and report:

That, from the great extent and diversity of the articles embraced by the resolution, it would be impracticable to make a statement sufficiently full to do justice to the subject, during the session of this convention. The committee have prescribed a course of duty for each member, for the purpose of obtaining information from the various sections of our country. The information thus obtained, the committee propose to transmit to their chairman for the purpose of having the statements arranged and submitted by him to the permanent committee, as provided by the vote of the convention. All which is respectfully submitted,

ISAAC TYSON, Jr. *Chairman.*

On motion the foregoing report was ordered to be laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. *Forward*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That it be recommended to the friends of American industry in every part of the union, to form associations in their several districts, for the purpose of collecting such statistical facts, relative to the present state of agriculture and manufactures as may tend to illustrate the benefits of the protective system, and to transmit them to the committee on statistics, appointed by this convention, with a view to their revision and publication.

The following report was then presented and read—

The committee to whom was referred the subject of cash payments for duties on imports— beg leave to report:

That they have had the subject under consideration, and are of opinion, that the establishment of such a system would materially aid the pursuits of American industry; but as the high interests of commerce are particularly connected with the matter, they respectfully recommend a postponement of the question on the present occasion, preferring a [more extensive] co-operation with the commercial community, to accomplish this desirable result. On behalf of the committee,

NATHAN BUNKER, *chairman.*

On motion—the foregoing report was ordered to be laid on the table.

The convention then adjourned.

Monday, October 31st 1831.

The convention being called to order,

On motion, Mr. Richards, of Vermont, Mr. Wingate, of Maine, Mr. N. Dubois, of New York, and Mr. Kelso, of Maryland, were added to the committee on the *growth of wool;* and Mr. Coxe, of Pennsylvania, to the general committee *No.* 4. and Mr. W. Jackson, of New Jersey, to the committtee on *iron and steel.*

The following report was then presented and read:

The committee on the production and manufacture of cotton, beg leave respectfully to report.

That they have had the subjects committed to them under consideration, and have taken measures to obtain the necessary information, which cannot be collected in season to report to this convention—but will loose no time in forwarding their report to the permanent committee.

P. T. JACKSON, *chairman.*

Which report was accepted.

On motion of Mr. *Crosby* of Massachusetts—the resolution offered by Mr. Forward, of Pennsylvania, and adopted on Saturday, was reconsidered —and amended by striking out the words "agriculture and manufactures" and substituting the words agriculture, commerce, manufactures and the mechanic arts—and the resolution, as amended, was then adopted.

Mr. *Ingersoll*, from the 1st general committee reported an *address to the people*—which having been read, it was

On motion of Mr. *Hemphill* of Pennsylvania,

Unanimously resolved, That the address be accepted, and the thanks of the convention be presented to the committee; and that twenty thousand copies be printed under their direction.

A report of the 4th general committee was read and ordered to be laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. *Wilkinson*, of New York, it was

Resolved, That the address to the people of the United States he printed with the names of the officers and members of this convention, so far as the same may be ascertained.

On motion—Mr. Wild and Mr. Williams, of New York, were added to the committee on the production and manufacture of *cotton.*

On motion of Mr. *E. Williams*, of New York, it was

Resolved, That the convention recommended to be held of the friends of the American System in the southern, south western and western states, be also recommended to convene at the city of Cincinnati on the first Monday of January next.

The following report was presented and read—

The committee on the manufacture of wool, respectfully ask leave to report:—Your committee, after repeated meetings and much consideration, find the magnitude of the subject such—extending over so many of the states, that it is impossible to embody correct information during the session of this convention, and ask for further time—and that their report may be received through the permanent committee.

E. H. ROBBINS, *chairman.*

Which was accepted

On motion—Messrs. Evans, T. Ellicott, Kennedy, of Maryland, Mr. Z. Allen, of Rhode Island and Mr. Merrick, of Pennsylvania, were added to the *permanent committee.*

On motion of Mr. *Hemphill*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That the permanent committee be authorised to depute, if they should deem it necessary, some person or persons to attend at Washington during the next session of congress, to support the views of this convention in regard to the cause of American industry.

The following report was presented and read—

The committee on the production and manufacture of *leather* cannot collect, during the session of the convention, facts enough, on which to predicate a report which would be satisfactory to the people or to themselves; they therefore ask further time, and permission to report to the permanent committee.

N. P. DENNY, *Chairman.*

Which was accepted

The convention then adjourned to 4 o'clock P. M.

Monday Oct. 31—4 *o'clock P. M.*

The convention met—Mr. *Lynch*, of New York, made the following communication:

The New York, city-delegation ask leave to be permitted to defray the expenses attending the sitting of the convention, to the end that the entire fund already constituted by the contribution of the delegates, be appropriated to printing and other future expenses, under the direction of the permanent committee, as already directed.

Which request was acceded to by the convention.

On motion it was—

Resolved, That the thanks of the convention be presented to the New York city delegation, for their very liberal proposition.

On motion of Mr. *McIlvaine*, of Pennsylvania, it was

Resolved, That a committee of three members be appointed (with a privilege of adding to their number), to collect and pay over to the chairman of the permanent committee, such voluntary contributions as may be offered, to defray any contingent expenses which may be incurred in carrying into effect the objects of this convention.

The president announced the following gentlemen to compose that committee.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. McIlvain,	Maryland,	Mr. Colt.
do.	Coleman,		

The following report was then presented and read:

The committee on the production and manufacture of *lead* beg leave to report—That they have had the subject under consideration, and inasmuch as the time allotted to them, during the continuance of the convention, is not sufficient to enable them to collect and report as fully and satisfactorily on this subject as its importance demands—they have instructed the members of their committee to collect and forward to the chairman of the committee all the facts which they can collect relative to the production, manufacture and consumption of *lead*, to be arranged and forwarded to the permanent committee.

JOHN P. WETHERILL,
A. BRACKENRIDGE.

On motion—the foregoing report was accepted.

The following report was presented and read—

The committee on "the product and manufacture of *copper*" have had the subject under consideration and ask leave to report—That from the shortness of the time allowed to prepare a detailed statement, they have found it impossible to present the subject to the convention in the manner its great importance demands—they have therefore appointed sub-committees to collect information on the subject, to be reported to the permanent committee. The information already obtained enables the committee to state, that the annual importation of copper, in pigs, bolt, sheet and other shapes, exceeds eight hundred thousand dollars. That there exists establishments for refining and rolling copper into bolt, sheet, brazier's and boiler copper in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, which work upwards of three millions pounds of pig or scrap copper annually—That copper ore has been found in the states of Missouri, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine—That the mines have been opened and ,wrought and furnaces for smelting erected in Missouri, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Vermont, from which small quantities of good copper have

been sent to market. That companies have been formed and measures taken to work the mines in Connecticut, New Hampshire and Maine—That there are good grounds for a reasonable belief that, before many years, our own mountains will yield a competent supply of this valuable metal for all the wants of this nation, and a surplus for exportation. All of which is respectfully submitted. In behalf of the committee,

J. P. SIMPSON, *Chairman.*

On motion, the foregoing report was accepted.

The following report was presented and read.

The committee appointed to report upon "the currency of the country, as affecting or affected by the protecting system," beg leave to report, in part—That they have had the subject under consideration, and are of opinion, that, inasmuch as it involves an enquiry into the cause and effect of the increase and diminution in the value of money, and consequently into the value of all articles which are the product of labor—it would be impracticable to prepare and present as clear and full a view of the subject during the short time which it is probable the convention will remain in session, as its great importance requires.

Your committee therefore respectfully ask permission to make their report to the permanent committee at as early a day as it can be prepared.

THOMAS ELLICOTT, *Chairman.*

On motion, the foregoing report was accepted.

On motion of Mr. *Cozzens* of Rhode Island, it was

Resolved, That it be recommended to the friends of the protection (by government) of national industry, throughout the union, to use their endeavors to procure the expression of the sense of their several state legislatures, in favor of the continuance of the system, and that each member of this convention render his aid in the same.

A report of the committee on *rates and duties* in foreign countries was presented, by Mr. *Carey*, of Pennsylvania, read and accepted. [See appendix.]

A report of the committee on the *growth of wool* was presented by Mr. *McGiffin* of Pennsylvania, read and accepted. [See appendix.]

On motion, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Keyser, of Maryland, were added to the committee on the *growth of wool*

On motion, Mr. Cozzens, of Rhode Island, was placed on the *permanent committee*, in room of Mr. Allen, who was excused at his own request.

Two reports from the committee on *iron and steel* were presented; that on steel by Mr. *Coates*, of Pennsylvania, and that on iron by Mr. *Howell*, of New York, which were read and accepted—and re-committed for such revision and addition as shall appear necessary.

A report of the committee on the culture of *silk and hemp* was presented by Mr. Sanders, of New York, which was read and accepted. [See appendix.]

On motion—Mr. Prince, of New York, was added to the committee on silk and hemp.

A report of the committee on *hats* was presented by Mr. Crolius, of New York; and read and accepted. [See appendix.]

On motion, the report of the committee on *sugar* was called up and accepted. [See appendix.]

On motion the report of the 4th general committee was called up and accepted. [See appendix.]

On motion of Mr. *Carey* of Pennsylvania,

Resolved, That the secretary of the convention cause one thousand copies of its proceedings to be printed for the use of the members.

The report of the committee on *cash payments* of duties was called up, and on motion—was amended by adding the words "more extensive" before the word "co-operation," and was then accepted as amended.

The report of the committee on *chemistry* was called up and accepted.

On motion of Mr. *Everett*, of Massachusetts, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the thanks of this convention be presented to the president and other officers, for the able, impartial, diligent and very acceptable manner in which they have discharged their various duties.

On motion of Mr. *Ellsworth*, of Connecticut,

Resolved, That the thanks of this convention be presented to the honorable corporation of the city of New York, for their generous offer of the very convenient Hall and committee rooms which the convention has occupied during its sittings.

The convention then adjourned.

Tuesday, November 1st 1831.

The convention met.

A communication from certain citizens of Kanawha county, Virginia, was read.

A communication was received from the agricultural and manufacturing society of Washington county, Pennsylvania, and referred to the permanent committee.

On motion of Mr. *Roberts*, of Pennsylvania,

Resolved, That the following gentlemen be added to the committee appointed to receive and pay over to the chairman of the permanent and central committee, such voluntary contributions as may be offered, to defray the contingent expenses of that committee.

Pennsylvania,	Mr. Riddle,	New York,	Mr. C. A. Davis,
Massachusetts,	Jackson,	Maryland,	Keyser.

A report of the committee on *evasions of the revenue* was presented and read by Mr. *Schenck*, of New York—and accepted; and, on motion of the same committee, it was

Resolved, That further time be allowed that committee to make out a more detailed report and to correspond with the secretary of the treasury for that purpose, and that they report to the permanent committee.

On motion,

Resolved, That certain persons appointed by citizens of Kanawha county be considered as members of this convention.

The committee on the production and manufacture of *salt* presented a report which was accepted and referred to the central committee, [See appendix.]

A report from the committee on hats, on the subject of *cabinet furniture*; was made by Mr. *Crolius*, of New York, and read and accepted. appendix.]

On motion of Mr. *Sayre*, of New York,

Resolved, That when this convention adjourns, it will adjourn *sine die*.

On motion of the same gentleman, it was

Resolved, That the president request the attendance of one of the reverend clergymen of this city to offer up to ALMIGHTY GOD, on our final adjournment, our united thanks for his past goodness to this nation, and implore his continuance of the same.

On motion of Mr. J. *Roberts*, of Pennsylvania,

Resolved, That the permanent committee of correspondence be, and they are hereby requested, if they deem it to be expedient, to call a general meeting of the friends of national industry to be held in the year 1832, at such time and place as they shall think most advisable.

On motion of Mr. *Sibley*, of Massachusetts, the following preamble and resolution was offered—

Whereas the object of this convention, is the promotion of American industry, in all its various branches throughout our whole country, based upon the principles of equality and justice to every section of the union; and whereas attempts have been made to excite discontent and jealousies between different states and interests re-

presented in this convention, and to connect with its deliberations party allusions and political feelings, therefore

Resolved, by this convention, that all attempts to connect with its objects any political or party purposes, or any political or party preferences, past or present—are viewed by this convention with strong disapprobation, and should be rejected with indignation; and all means employed to excite a spirit of jealousy between the different states and sections of this union and its various interests as connected with the protection of American industry, are regarded as striking at the foundation of our system, which can be sustained only by a union of interests—a union of feeling—a union of action—and the union of the states.

On motion of Mr. *A. Lawrence*, of Massachusetts,

Resolved, That the thanks of this convention be presented to *Mathew Carey*, esq. for his early, able and distinguished labors to create, diversify and sustain the industry of the American people.

On motion of Mr. *Paine*, of New York,

Resolved, That the thanks of this convention be presented to *Hezekiah Niles*, esq. for his long, able and invincible efforts in the cause of his country, and especially in developing her internal resources.

On motion of Mr. *Jackson*, of Massachusetts,

Resolved, That the several committees appointed to obtain information respecting the products and manufactures of the United States, be requested to make their reports to the permanent committee at the earliest possible date, consistent with the necessity and importance of the utmost accuracy in the statements they may render.

On motion of Mr. *Williams*, of New York,

Resolved, That Messrs. Seymour, Greele and Craig, of New York, be a committee to report to the permanent committee on the manufacture of paper.

On motion, Messrs. Walter Cunningham, M. Carpenter and Livingston of New York, were added to the committee on the growth of wool.

On motion of Mr. *Riddle*, of Pennsylvania,

Resolved, That Mr. Dutton, and Mr. J. B. Brown, of Massachusetts, Mr. Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Tallmadge, of New York, be added to the permanent committee.

On motion of Mr. *Murray*, of New York,

Resolved, That it be referred to the committee on evasions of the revenue, to report to the permanent committee on the expediency of substituting, as the criterion of duty, in lieu of the value at the place of manufacture, the value at the place of importation, on all foreign goods subject to ad valorem or minimum rates of duties.

On motion, Mr. *Murray*, of New York, was added to the committee on evasions of the revenue.

On motion, Mr. Robinson, of New York, was added to the committee on the manufacture of wool.

On motion of Mr. *McClurg*, of Pennsylvania,

Resolved, That Messrs. Binney and Parmenter, of Massachusetts, Bakewell and E. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, and Crolius, of New York, be a committee to report to the central committee on the subject of glass, porcelain and all other manufactures from clay.

On motion, Mr. Stearns, of Massachusetts, was added to the committee on paper.

On motion, Mr. Schenck, of New York, was added to the permanent committee.

At the request of the president, the throne of grace was addressed in a fervent prayer by the rev. Mr. Schroeder—and the convention then adjourned *sine die*.

J. W. PEIRCE, *recording secretary.*

CHARLES PAINE, *assistant secretary.*

I have collated and revised the preceding records by the original motions, reports, &c.

H. NILES, *secretary,*
and chairman of the permanent committee.

BALTIMORE, *November* 10, 1831.

ADDRESS

OF THE

FRIENDS OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRY,

ASSEMBLED

IN CONVENTION, AT NEW-YORK,

OCTOBER 26, 1831,

TO

THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Published by order of the Convention.

BALTIMORE, NOVEMBER 10, 1831.

TO THE

PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

FELLOW-CITIZENS—

A numerous delegation from several states in the Union have convened in the city of New York representing great national interests which they are anxious, by the most efficient but peaceable means, to defend and support. In addressing themselves to the people of the United States, they invoke their candid attention to several topics of great national importance, without assuming any authority ultimately to decide them; conscious that their reasonings and opinions can have, and ought to have, no other influence or force than belongs to their truth and soundness.

A system of laws imposing duties for the encouragement and protection of domestic industry, upon the faith of which a large portion of the people of this country have invested their property and given a new direction to their labour, and with a continuance of which are completely identified all their hopes of maintenance for themselves and their families, has been recently denounced as "distinguished by every characteristic which may define a tyranny, the most odious." The entire abolition of this system, vitally involving the interests of Farmers, Mechanics, Manufacturers, Merchants and all the labouring classes, has been demanded in a tone that offers no hope of condition or compromise. A submission to such a demand, with or without the consent of those who must be the victims, would be marked by such scenes of ruin and despair, as no one, not blinded by the strongest passions of our nature, could witness without compunction.

We address ourselves, then, to the enlightened patriotism of our fellow-citizens in every part of the Union; and we earnestly entreat them to accompany us in the examination which we propose to make of the arguments and statements recently put forth; appealing to their clear discernment of truth, their high sense of duty and their calm moral courage to avert the evils that now seem to threaten the prosperity and peace of the country.

Of these topics, the first in order and the gravest in character, respects the

constitutional power of Congress to pass the laws which are the subject of complaint.

As a constitutional question the inquiry is not whether the laws are wise or unwise, whether in their operations they are always equal, or sometimes unequal, or whether individuals may not think them so wide a departure from a just administration of the powers of the government as to be, in an indefinite and loose sense, inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution. The true and real question is, do they exceed the power of the law-giver; and do they, for that reason, fail to be obligatory?

We dissent from the notion that laws plainly unconstitutional may be yet so framed as to escape the animadversion of courts of law. If unconstitutional, their true character will either appear on their face or may be made to appear by stating the facts which fasten that character upon them. And if the motives, which are supposed to have influenced Congress in their enactment are not facts which may be properly inquired into to give them this character, the reason is, not that Congress has executed an unlawful power or veiled an unlawful purpose under a general law, but that the general power being given to Congress, to pass such laws, the purpose of the law, like its occasion, its duration, or any other part of its character, is constitutionally referred to the discretion of Congress.

The present constitution has been in operation (with a success not more gratifying to ourselves than surprising to the rest of the world) for forty-two years. Twenty-one different Congresses, regularly elected and appointed by the people, and their agents, and the state Legislatures, have successively assembled to enact laws under its authority. Seven distinguished individuals have been called by the voice of the country to the chair of the Chief Magistracy, all holding and some of them, on various occasions, having exercised the power of giving a negative to such acts of Congress as, in their opinion, transcended the just limit of legislative authority. During the same period a supreme Judicial Tribunal has existed, not less distinguished for purity and talent than for dignity and importance, whose high function it properly is to pronounce its solemn judgment on the constitutional extent of the power of Congress whenever any exercise of that power is complained of and the case is brought duly before it. Most of these successive Congresses have passed laws similar in character, in design, and in effect, to the acts now complained of; and all of them have unequivocally sanctioned their principle. All these Chief Magistrates, in like manner, have, without doubt or hesitation, recognized the existence of the power; and no question of its validity has been raised in the Judicial Tribunals.—It is under this weight of authority, and this length of practice in its favour, and after the investment, upon the faith of it, of a capital probably amount-

ing to two hundred and fifty millions of dollars, that a disposition has now sprung up to deny the power altogether, and to propose, if its exercise be persisted in, a resort to such means of redress as threaten the Union.

We cannot but persuade ourselves that before the American People abandon a system of laws, now of long continuance, passed at different times by the constituted authorities with the full approbation of the whole country; and especially, before they break up their Government and return to a state of anarchy, on the ground that such laws are unconstitutional, they will give to that question a very careful and serious consideration.

Before proceeding to express the general views entertained on this important subject by the members of this convention, it is not altogether uninteresting to inquire how far admissions or concessions have been made by those who deny the existence of the power, notwithstanding the general and positive terms in which that denial is expressed.

It seems to us, indeed, that the plain object of the constitution, and the strong reason of the case, have driven those who deny the power, even upon their own mistaken view of its source, into the necessity of making admissions which, when made, leave no ground for their argument. They deny that Congress can rightfully lay duties for the sole, or the main purpose, of encouraging manufactures; but they admit, at the same time, that Congress may lay duties for revenue, and that, in laying such duties, it *may so arrange them as incidentally to give protection to manufactures.* They admit, too, that Congress may lay duties not designed for revenue, *but designed to countervail the injurious regulations of foreign powers.* Are not these concessions inconsistent with the main proposition? How can it be longer denied that Congress may lay duties for protection, after it is conceded that it may arrange duties with that view? It cannot be true that the power was given for revenue only, and that it ought to be strictly confined to that object, and true, also, that, in selecting subjects of duties, regard may be had to a different object.

An individual in society is the consumer of a particular foreign article; he finds it heavily taxed by duties, while other articles, equally capable of producing revenue, are untaxed. Does it make any difference to him, whether the article necessary to him was seized on, as the main purpose of the law, with the sole object of protection, or whether it was only *incidentally selected* in order to favour the manufacturer, while the commodities consumed by his neighbours, though equally fit subjects for a tax for revenue, are passed over in this incidental arrangement? Will not every ingenuous mind at once agree that if the power to lay duties was conferred on Congress for the sole purpose of revenue, it is a violation of its trust to mingle any other purpose with that, as much as it would be to substitute an entire new

purpose for it? Congress cannot look with one glance to revenue, and the other to protection, if the constitution limit its power to revenue alone. When it is thus said that protection is a fit object to be regarded *incidentally*, in laying duties, but that the general purpose must still be revenue, who shall inform us how much, in the motives of Congress, must be the main purpose of revenue, and how much may be the incidental purpose of protection? How high may the incidental object rise, and the law be yet constitutional; or at what point will it have approached so near the main, or the only object of the duty, as to render the law void? It may be answered, possibly, that the admission goes no farther than this: that when Congress has already resolved to lay duties, then it may, as a subsequent resolution, resolve to lay them on such a selection of articles as shall best favour manufactures. But would not such a subsequent resolution be wholly aside from the exercise of a mere revenue power? Would it not be a clear imposition of duties for protection? And might it not lead, practically, to the same consequences, since, under this admitted power of selection and arrangement, the whole burden of the government might be laid with a direct view to protection merely.

The other admission, that is, that Congress may lay duties *to countervail the commercial relations of other states*, seems to us still more decisive. This concedes, at once, that the power to lay duties is not a mere revenue power; for here is one admitted case, in which it may properly be exercised, which has no relation to revenue. Yet this is no particular or specified power. The constitution no more points out this, as being a proper object, than it points out protection. If it be provided for at all, it is because it is embraced in the general words of the grant. It is there, or it is no where. Laws, laying duties to countervail the regulations of other states, are regulations of trade. They are not only *like* laws of protection, but they are, emphatically, *themselves laws of protection.* They have usually no other end or design than to protect the manufactures or other interests of our own citizens from the effect of unequal competition or monopoly on the part of other nations. Congress, then, upon this admission, may lay duties with the single object of encouraging certain descriptions of domestic employment or industry; and it remains for those who concede this, and yet deny the general power, to show how it is, that Congress has power, in its discretion, to protect some classes of industry and no power, in the same discretion and by the same means, to protect others. But the admission goes still further. It not only furnishes an analogy for the case in argument, but meets and covers that identical case. The laws so much opposed, and whose constitutional validity is so loudly denied, are themselves no other than so many acts passed *to countervail the injurious commercial regulations of foreign states.*

The United States have not been the first to reject the theory of free trade. They have not introduced into the world new modes of legislation. They have not originated a system of protection; far otherwise. At the very moment they had succeeded to throw off their colonial bondage and had established their own independence they found that their condition, so far as respected Commerce, Agriculture and Manufactures, was but partially bettered by the change, because they found the ports of the leading states of Europe shut against their ships and against their products. They offered free trade to all nations; but the nations, with one accord, rejected their offer. The subjects of other states were protected, as against them, by the laws of other states; but *they* were protected against nobody. It is undeniably true, that this condition of things was one of the very causes which led to the adoption of the present government. It is unquestionable, as matter of historic record, that one strong motive for forming and establishing the present constitution was to organize a government that should possess the power of countervailing these foreign regulations by adequate measures and thereby protecting the labour and industry of the people of the country. Countervailing laws were accordingly passed at the very first session of the first Congress; others have been passed at various times since; one and all, they partake of the same character; they are all countervailing laws rendered expedient and necessary by the policy pursued by other nations. The Republic is now composed of thirteen millions of people; all the principal products of eight or nine of these thirteen millions are, at this moment, shut out from the great market of consumption abroad, either by absolute prohibition or by high duties; and it is to meet this state of things, it is to countervail these foreign regulations, so injurious to us, it is to place ourselves on some footing of equality, it is to rescue the labour of the American people from an inferiority, a subjection, at once dishonourable and burdensome, at once degrading to its character while it increases its toils, that those very laws were originally passed, have all along continued, and now exist. They are, therefore, countervailing laws and no other, in every just sense of these terms.

Having made these remarks on what is conceded by those who deny the power of Congress to protect manufactures, and on the effect of that concession, we proceed to present the view which this meeting entertains on the general constitutional question.

By the constitution Congress has power, "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises." It has power also "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

The power to lay duties is accompanied by one express qualification o limitation, which is, "that all duties shall be uniform throughout the

United States." The power to regulate commerce has its limitation also, which is, that no regulation of commerce shall give preference to the ports of one state over those of another; and there is another limitation, which may apply to both clauses, namely, that no export duty shall ever be laid.

Here then is a grant of power in broad and general terms, but with certain specific limitations, carefully expressed. But neither of these limitations applies, in any manner, to that exercise of the power which is now under consideration. Neither of them, nor any other clause or word in the whole constitution manifests the slightest intention to restrain the words so as to prohibit Congress from laying duties for protection. The attempt is nothing less than to add a restriction which the constitution has omitted. Who has authority to add this? If other restrictions had been intended they would have been expressed. When the business of limitation was before the convention what was omitted was as much an exercise of intention as what was expressed. It stated all the restraints on Congress which it intended; and to impose others now would be, not to interpret the constitution, but to change it; not to construe the existing instrument, but to make another.

The words of the grant being general, to lay duties and to regulate commerce, their meaning is to be ascertained by reference to the common use and import of language. No unusual signification is to be given to the terms, either to restrain or enlarge their import. Congress, in its discretion, is to lay duties and to regulate trade for all the objects and purposes for which duties are ordinarily laid and trade ordinarily regulated. If such a thing was never before heard of as laying duties and regulating trade with a view to encourage manufactures, then it might be said that the convention did not contemplate such an exercise of the power by Congress. But it was perfectly known to the convention and to the people of this country that one leading object with all governments, in laying duties and regulating trade, was, and for a long time had been, the encouragement of manufactures. This was emphatically true of England whose language the convention spoke and whose legal and legislative phraseology was theirs also. Every leading state of Europe was, at that moment, regulating its commerce for purposes of this nature. Such a purpose, indeed, had been long sought to be accomplished by some of the states themselves, by their own regulations of trade. Massachusetts had attempted it, New-York had attempted it, Virginia had attempted it, and we believe other states had done the same. How ineffectual all their attempts were, for want of union and a general system, was soon seen, and felt, by the whole country; but they shew to what ends, and to what uses the power to regulate trade was understood to extend. But not only in other na-

tions, and in the states, before the adoption of the present Constitution, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter, but in the United States since, and in the administration of this very constitution, regulations of trade have been made, in almost innumerable instances, with no view to revenue, but with a sole and exclusive regard to protection.

If our understanding of the constitution be not according to its true meaning, that instrument has been grossly violated from the very beginning. What are all the registry acts; what the bounties on the fisheries, but so many avowed efforts to protect American Industry, under the power of regulating trade? On what foundation, does the whole system of the coasting trade stand? The American ship-builder and ship-owner has enjoyed, from the first, and we think properly, not only protection in that trade, but the monopoly of it. He shuts out all foreign competition, and he does so on the ground that the public good is promoted by giving him this advantage. We think he is right in asking this, and the Government right in granting it. Yet this is not free trade: it is preference;—it is *protection*, and protection of a manufacture under the power to regulate trade. The laws giving this protection to the manufacture and the use of ships may be wise and laws protecting other manufactures, may be unwise. But the first cannot be constitutional and the latter not constitutional. If there be power for one, there is power for both. Both are drawn from the same grant, both operate by the same general means, and both regard the same object, the protection, namely, of American labour and capital against foreign competition. If it be said that the navigation act is founded in national policy and that it is essential to national defence and national independence, we admit it. But we answer, in the first place, that Congress could not exercise a power not granted, merely because it might be useful or necessary: and, in the second place, we say that the same remark is true of the policy of protecting manufactures. That policy, also, is essential to national independence.—Iron, hemp and clothing for sailors and soldiers are not less indispensable to national defence than ships and seamen. Not only in the general use of language, then, does the power of laying duties and regulating trade extend to the protection, by the use of such means, of domestic manufactures, but such has been the constant interpretation of the constitution itself.

We think, indeed, that when a general power is given to Congress by the constitution of the United States, in plain and unambiguous words, their acts are constitutional and valid if they are within the scope of the granted power; and that, in considering the validity of the law, the motives of the legislature can never be investigated. Having granted the power,

with such limits expressed as were thought proper, its exercise, within those limits, is left to the discretion of Congress.

What is the true character of the opposite doctrine? It is, that the constitutionality of a law depends, not on its provisions and enactments, but on the motives of those who passed it. Is not such a notion new? How are we to ascertain the motives of a legislature? By private enquiry; by public examination; by conjecture? The law may be passed on mixed motives: some members voting for revenue; some for protection; or one house may act with one view, and the other house with another. What will be the character of such a law?

According to this new theory, if the motives be constitutional then the act is; if the motives be unconstitutional then the act is unconstitutional also. It follows, therefore, that a law passed by one Congress may be constitutional which, if passed by another, though in the same words, would be unconstitutional. Besides, on this theory a law may be unconstitutional for its omissions as well as its enactments; because, in laying duties, articles may be omitted as well as articles inserted, from a design to favour manufactures.

We may pursue this inquiry a step farther.

In order to ascertain whether an act were passed *primarily* for revenue, the construing power must be authorized to inquire whether that revenue be *necessary*. For if it be conceded that Congress has a constitutional power to raise an indefinite amount of revenue, such a concession will cover any system of imposts that mayever be adopted. The right to raise more revenue than the expenses of government require implies the exercise of a power to tax under circumstances in which the raising of revenue cannot be a primary purpose, but in which a purpose to protect industry or, in other words, what has been called the incidental object, may be rendered, in effect, the principal object of the tax, although veiled under the revenue power. For these reasons we say it follows as an inevitable consequence, under this view of the source of the protective power, that the constitutionality of any system of imposts, professing to be directed to revenue, must depend upon the fact whether that revenue be *necessary* to the government or not.

The statement of such a consequence is sufficient to show what endless difficulties must embarrass the operations of the government in defining the limits of this incidental protection, which has been alleged to be the only protection that the constitution allows, and of itself affords, what we conceive to be, an unanswerable argument against referring the right to protect industry exclusively to that clause of the constitution which authorizes Congress to lay imposts for the purposes of revenue.

To determine whether any proposed amount of revenue be necessary

would, in a great number of cases, prove a fruitful source of vexatious and unprofitable controversy. One party,—conceiving it wise to improve the face of their territory with expensive roads and canals, to provide fortifications and the munitions of war, and to accumulate treasure in the expectation of national difficulties,—would find good reason to maintain that a *large* revenue was indispensable to the nation. With this party a high and burdensome rate of imposts, fully adequate to the most extensive protection of manufactures that has ever been asked for, would be a constitutional application of the revenue power. Another party, more thrifty in their policy, holding that the expenditures of the government should be graduated to the lowest practicable scale of economy, would contend that nothing should be raised by duties above the ordinary supplies necessary for the pay of the public agents. With this class all the excess, above the sum that they might hold to be necessary, would be the fruit of an unconstitutional tax. Who should judge between these conflicting opinions? If such were the limits upon the power of Congress it would be true, as has been said, that there might be acts in violation of the constitution which would elude the notice of the judicial tribunals; but the evident absurdity of subjecting the right to exercise fundamental powers to so vague and intangible a standard of interpretation, furnishes one of the most satisfactory proofs that no such intention existed in the minds of those who framed our constitution.

Pursuing the investigation, it will be found that the difficulty attending this notion of the source of the protecting power does not end with the impracticability of determining upon the *necessity* of revenue. It goes still deeper. It is affirmed, and no doubt with truth, that a reduction of duties upon the necessaries or customary luxuries of a nation frequently increases the revenue. In such an event the defenders of the position that the power of Congress is limited to the supply of a necessary revenue, will find themselves unexpectedly put in possession of a surplus income which, according to the assumed principle, they had no right to raise; and it will be apparent that the people will be even more taxed than they were before; for the duty having been rendered productive of a larger amount of revenue to the government, a greater aggregate sum will have been taken from the pockets of the people; and it will then be found that Congress, instead of lessening the public burthens by their reduction of duties, will have only been encouraging the consumption of a greater quantity of the taxed article. A large consumption with a small tax being, in this case, more than equivalent to a small consumption with a large tax. And thus, in spite of all the precautions which the most scrupulous guardians of the constitution may exercise, the public functionaries, against their will and with the most conscientious desire to avoid infractions of the law, will oftentimes be fated to discover that they have produced unconstitutional results. The only rem-

edy for which would seem to be to abandon this intractable mode of taxation by imposts and resort to direct taxes upon the people.

As long, however, as such results may follow the reduction of duties, it will be seen that a system which merely increases the consumption of imported commodities without diminishing the revenue will be, in effect, the adoption of a policy for the encouragement of *foreign industry*. And we might here pause and ask, whether it can be supposed that the founders of our government intended to give a power to Congress to adopt a scheme of policy directed to the encouragement of *foreign labour* by a scale of low duties, without also allowing to that body a right, when they found it convenient, to encourage *domestic industry* by a higher scale of duties? Let those who answer this question in the affirmative, show some reason for the opinion that the convention which framed the constitution should set more value upon a power to encourage foreign industry, under any possible necessity to exercise it, than upon a similar power to encourage and protect our own.

We think we have said enough to indicate the pernicious tendencies of the doctrine, sustained by many eminent citizens of our land, which ascribes the right to protect domestic manufactures, solely to the revenue power conferred by the constitution upon Congress; and have demonstrated that this error, if adopted, must lead the public functionaries into practical embarrassments entirely irreconcileable with a wholesome administration of the laws.

With a view to show that the protection of manufacturing industry is mainly referrible to the power to regulate commerce, and was intended to be embraced by the clause of the constitution that invests the supreme legislature with that power, in addition to the suggestions that we have already made, we deem it not unprofitable briefly to recur to the history of the country, from which we shall derive lights that may guide us to the most unerring conclusions in confirmation of our doctrine. The narrative of events from 1783 to 1787, the circumstances attending the adoption of the constitution and the range of its early operations, whilst yet in the hands of its authors, afford a mass of testimony that Congress has but responded to the expectations of the country in so regulating trade as to furnish the requisite protection to the expansion and growth of our own labour.

The *regulation of commerce* was not a new term invented by the framers of the constitution. It was at the time of the adoption of that instrument by the people a term familiar to their apprehension and impressed upon their understandings, by the strongest comments that the history of oppression could furnish. The war of the revolution, that had just closed, sprang out of the conflicts in which this subject had been presented in the countless forms which an engrossing topic of complaint may be supposed to assume in

the discussions of an excited and rebelling people. The same subject had been canvassed in the British Parliament until argument and declamation were exhausted. The mother country had regulated the commerce of the colonies, through a series of odiers and unfeeling restrictions, for more than a century, until the phrase had acquired the notoriety of a hateful grievance. She had fettered their trade by cruel prohibitions, and controlled their labour by systems of denial that reduced them to the lowest state of suffering; yet it is remarkable, that, deeming this oppressive policy a lawful exercise of the prerogative of regulating commerce, the colonists submitted to these evils with a resignation that indicated their sense of the duty of obedience to an acknowledged though misused power. All manufactures calculated to bring wealth into the country, were strictly forbidden; the erection of forges, for example, was denounced as a nuisance, and these establishments were liable to be abated by that name: it was declared unlawful to export the simplest fabrics, even of shoes or hats, from one province to another. Still the people did not deny the legality of these attempts to *regulate commerce*. But when the right was assumed to *collect revenue* in the colonies for the benefit of the mother country, the first assertion of such a principle was met by open rebellion. The distinction was palpable enough, to every man, between these two pretensions of authority. It is worthy of remark, that Lord Chatham, in 1765 in the British House of Commons, distinctly defined the two branches of power in terms that literally apply to the subject we have been discussing, and which show how clearly they were brought to the notice of the country: 'there is a plain distinction,' is his language, 'between taxes levied for the purpose of raising a revenue, and duties imposed *for the regulation of trade*, for the accommodation of the subject; although in the consequences, *some revenue might incidentally arise from the latter*.'—Indeed, the whole tenor of the public discussion on those subjects, so rife at that period throughout England and America, furnishes the most conclusive evidence that a specific idea was attached to the phrase incorporated into our constitution, and that its scope was to include the idea of levying duties in such a form as to encourage and protect, or, at least, to control and direct the growth of domestic industry.

The complaints against the articles of confederation, for which the constitution was substituted, embraced, amongst other things, an objection to the forms by which the legislation in reference to the regulation of commerce was impeded; and it was a prominent design of the new constitution to remedy this defect. The right to lay even prohibitory duties was freely admitted in the discussions upon the constitution; and we may safely affirm that the whole nation, at that day, regarded such a power as one of the necessary conclusions from the grant that had been made. The subsequent action of the government corroborates this idea. The first ap-

proaches of the people to their new rulers were made in behalf of the exercise of a protecting power in favour of their industry. They spoke of the injury they had sustained under the former state of things; of the ruinous competition to which the policy of the mother country had exposed them; and demanded the establishment of a system of measures that should accomplish their favorite purpose of creating a vigorous domestic manufacture. The unrestrained admission of British goods had reduced our manufacturers and artizans to absolute want: the free entry of British shipping had expelled our vessels from the ocean. From Charleston to Boston this condition of things was the subject of one loud and continued remonstrance; and the remedy for it was a prominent object in the establishment of a new general government. The ship-builders and the shipowners complained that foreign bottoms brought to the country all that was imported, to their ruin; and they besought their fellow-citizens to join them in measures of protection. The manufacturers and mechanics declared that it was of little importance to them in what bottoms articles were imported, since this unrestricted importation, in whatever bottoms, threatened to reduce them to starvation. Both had applied to their own state governments for redress, but these governments, from want of concert, could give no effectual relief. Attempts had been made to amend the articles of confederation for the very purpose of conferring this power upon congress; but these attempts had failed. Hence it was that the establishment of the present government was hailed with the utmost enthusiasm and celebrated in the principal cities, by all classes, with manifestations of hope and joy.

The earliest legislation of the new government avows and adopts the principle for which we have been contending. The first important act on the statute book contains the following preamble:—'Whereas it is necessary for the support of government and *the encouragement and protection of manufactures* that duties be laid on goods and merchandise.'—This preamble was written, supported and passed by those who had come recently from the convention where the Constitution had been formed. They were carrying into effect their own instrument. They seem, indeed,—for preambles are quite unusual,—to have introduced this for the purpose of shewing the country that its expectations would be fulfilled, and that the manufactures of the nation would be protected. If, therefore, the existing laws violate the Constitution, the original act violated it. If this charter of right be marred now, it was marred then, and marred by those who made it.

If protection be unconstitutional, this law carries unconstitutionality in its front; and yet, not one member of the first Congress appears to have thought it unconstitutional. In the whole course of the debates, protracted through several weeks, no one expressed a doubt of the power of Congress

to lay duties for protection; we may therefore affirm that the power was admitted by all. Some articles were taxed for revenue only; some for protection only; and some for both. The published debates show all this, and, as we have already said, every Congress, from that day to this, has recognised the same power. Every President, beginning with him who is justly esteemed the Father of his Country, has sanctioned it, and most of them have recommended its exercise, in earnest terms. Indeed, it has been constantly exercised; protection has been given by the registry acts; it has been given by the tonnage duty acts; it has been given by the acts regulating the coasting trade; it has been given to the fisheries; it has been given to the cotton of Carolina; to the coal of Virginia; to the hemp of Kentucky; to the lead of Missouri and Illinois; to the sugar of Louisiana, to the iron of the middle, western and southern States; and it has been given to the various artisans, mechanics and manufacturers. It is now forty-two years since this system of protection began, and it has never been intermitted or suspended, with regard to many commodities, for a single hour. Is all this legislation now to be deemed unconstitutional? Are all these interests to be brought into jeopardy, and perhaps to ruin, upon this modern construction of the constitution?

Not only has Congress thus constantly exercised this power, but it has thought itself, from the first, under peculiar obligations to exercise it. It has considered that it would be guilty of a plain breach of duty if it should not exercise it; and so it was declared in its first session. This policy was more earnestly enforced upon Congress because the States had surrendered their whole power on this question, and were, themselves, prohibited from exercising it by the constitution itself; since as they could not, as separate States, exercise it well, it was taken away from them and vested in the national legislature. It was said, therefore, and said truly, that it would be a fraud upon the States, if Congress, now the sole possessor of the power, should refuse to exercise it. The constitution had declared, that no State should lay any duty except for the mere purpose of enforcing its inspection laws.—Is it conceivable, that the people would agree to deprive their own state governments of the power of protecting manufactures, by suitable regulations of trade, without the consent of Congress, for any other reason than because this power was intentionally transferred to the general Government? The doctrine now advanced, imputes the strangest absurdity, both to the framers of the constitution and to the people. It supposes them, instead of creating a new remedy for acknowledged evils, to have forever abolished the poor but only remedy which already existed. It supposes, that instead of giving to Congress, as was their avowed design, effectual power to protect manufactures, they did no more than prohibit the States from

exercising that power, and extinguish it as a thing to be deprecated every where and altogether.—It supposes them to have imposed new shackles on their own limbs, and to have surrendered themselves, thus voluntarily bound, to the mercy of their foreign competitors and rivals. We cannot yield our assent to opinions, which ascribe purposes like these, or a policy like this, either to the Convention, or to the people.

It only remains for us to add, that the public judgment has, at all times, affirmed the existence of this power, and approved its exercise. Even at this moment, there is no reason to doubt that nine tenths of all the people hold the power to be constitutional. It is, therefore, not only against the words of the constitution, against the manifest design of the nation in establishing it, against the uniform sense of Congress in passing laws under it, against the practice of forty years, never stayed nor suspended, against the opinion of every tribunal in the country, as far as we are informed; but it is also against the entire conviction of a vast majority of the people themselves, that these new and what we think dangerous opinions, are now brought forward as the true doctrines of the constitution.

It is an error to suppose that the *regulation of commerce* should necessarily imply the denial of a right to restrict, diminish or prohibit any particular branch of it. The *suppression* of any trade, injurious to the community, is as much a national concern, and as valuable an exercise of power, as the *encouragement* of other branches; and, indeed, in practice it must often occur that the conferring of special advantages upon one branch of trade may operate partially to the disadvantage of all others. Such is often the effect of treaties that reserve to the vessels of particular nations free entry to our ports: the commerce with such nations is promoted to the diminution of the trade with others not embraced in the privilege. This, however, is a lawful, just and profitable regulation of commerce. Commerce includes all kinds of traffic, whether sustained upon the ocean in ships, or transported on roads, rivers or canals: whether it belong to the system of domestic exchanges, or is conversant with the occupations of foreign countries; and it is the appropriate function of Congress to regulate it in such manner as their wisdom may dictate, unlimited by any restraints except those which the constitution imposes on the power over the domestic intercourse of the States. The regulation of our commerce with the Indian tribes has subjected the traffic, from time to time, to all such restrictions as the national legislature found it prudent to adopt; and yet this right of regulation has passed unquestioned, though it has been directly exercised to the diminution of any species of traffic that has been considered hurtful.

It is nothing more than a regulation of commerce to shape our policy, in

reference to our intercourse with foreign nations, by such rules as shall increase the products of our own labour to an amount that may render them also the subjects of a foreign trade, and thereby extend our commerce to new regions, and give it new accumulations of commodities. The agricultural products of a nation are not the only elements of its trade; its manufactures may be as desirable to foreign communities, and their transportation and exchange may become fully as valuable foundations of a rapid, enlarged and profitable commerce. Why, then, should the power to regulate commerce be supposed to be arrested at that middle point between the prosecution of an old trade and the commencement of a new one that may, eventually, be rendered more expansive, useful and productive than any other? Such a restraint would seem to be utterly incompatible with the genius and character of any vigorous community, but especially with that of a young and healthy nation.

Before we leave this branch of our inquiry we are anxious to present the constitutional question in one more point of view. The best expositor of the constitution is that instrument itself.

The tenth section of the first article of the constitution provides that "no state shall, *without the consent of Congress*, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws." The limitation which is here set upon the legislation of the states is within the controul of Congress. The *consent* of that body releases any state from the restriction expressed in this clause; and consequently Congress may permit either or all of the states, separately, to levy such duties upon imports as they may think convenient: it may allow the state of South Carolina, for example, to enact a tariff of the highest rates of duties, directed exclusively to the protection of any branch of industry they may wish to foster. It will be observed that the terms of this clause of the constitution absolutely forbid the idea that such a power is to be exercised for revenue. The state that imposes the duty is inhibited from taking the avails into its own treasury, but must pay them over to the general government; whilst that government, on the other hand, has the fullest power to levy and collect its own revenues, and consequently cannot be presumed to yield its consent to the state enactment upon considerations of that nature. That consent, therefore, is intended to be given, if it be ever asked, from a conviction of the beneficial effect expected to be produced in the state that levies the duty—or in other words, of its value as a protection to state labour. With such a power on the part of Congress to permit a protective system to be enacted in the states severally, it would seem to be a solecism to suppose that the exercise of a similar power was intended to be denied to the national legislature itself to whom has been

emphatically entrusted the whole complicated and interesting concern of regulating commerce.

In dismissing this review of the principles and practice of our government in their relation to an important constitutional right, we take the occasion to say that we contemplate the character of the present opposition to what we have endeavoured to exhibit as the legitimate powers of Congress, with regret; and if we could persuade ourselves that it was destined to command the assent of any large portions of our population, we would say that we view it not without alarm. This opposition appeals not to the discretion of Congress; it seeks no modification, nor qualification, but demands an entire and absolute surrender of the principle. It is for the American people to decide whether this surrender can be made. For ourselves, we do not scruple to declare that, in our opinion, to give up this power would be to give up the constitution. If Congress be stripped of this prerogative and the restriction against its exercise be still imposed upon the states, it is quite plain to our apprehension, that the doom of our happy and prosperous constitution is sealed. We consider this question, therefore, as vital; and we look to the perpetuation of the power which we have laboured to defend, and its just exercise, to be indispensable to the preservation of that government which has conferred on the people of these states innumerable blessings.

You are next invited to examine the subject in its connexion with the principles of an enlightened political economy. The system which we maintain rests upon the following principles:

All the means of human enjoyment, and all the accumulations of wealth, are the product of human labour.—National happiness and national wealth are, therefore, promoted in proportion to the active industry of the community; and that industry is in proportion to the inducements to labour, arising from the amount and certainty of its remuneration. The immediate instrument for calling labour into action is capital. Capital is necessary to furnish the labourer with the means of applying his labour to advantage, whether in the simple tools of agriculture and some of the mechanic arts, or in the complicated and expensive machinery, applied to certain branches of manufacture, the modern improvements in which have added so much to the productive power of man.

It is a settled axiom, that the industry of a nation is in proportion to the capital devoted to its maintenance. It is, therefore, thought to be a wise policy to multiply the inducements to apply capital to the employment of labour at home, rather than to the purchase abroad and traffic in commodities of foreign production, by which, the capital of the country is made to set in motion foreign labour. This is founded on the principle, universal-

ly admitted, that there is, in every nation, a power or capability of labour beyond that actually put forth; and that its effective industry is proportioned to the stimulus applied in the shape of capital. This constitutes the American System. It invites the application of American capital to stimulate American industry. It imposes a restriction, in the form of an impost duty, on certain products of *foreign* labour; but so far as relates to *American* capital, or *American* labour, it simply offers security and inducement to the one, and gives energy and vigour to the other. The purpose of the protective system being thus directed to the utmost expansion of the industry of the nation into every channel of domestic competition, it would seem to be manifestly erroneous to call such a system *restrictive*, inasmuch as the avenues of labour in the internal organization of any community are much more numerous and extensive, than those which belong to foreign trade: whilst, on the other hand, there are no restrictions so severe upon the occupation of our citizens, and none that so irresistibly impel labour into a small number of channels as those that are created by the capital and industry of older nations when concentrated and brought into competition with the capital and industry of a young people in their first attempts to possess themselves of the arts that create and accumulate wealth. A nation that is devoted to agriculture only, and is dependent upon foreign labour for its manufactures, presents the spectacle of a people whose industry is confined to the single occupation of cultivating the soil, and transporting its products abroad, and is always subject to be disturbed by the policy of those on whom it depends for the purchase of its products: but the same nation, when encouraged in the attempt to supply itself with manufactured fabrics, releases its labour from the restraints of its previous straitened condition, and is seen rapidly diversifying its pursuits until they finally cover the whole space that was originally divided between itself and the people that supplied it with manufactures.

It is true, that a different system of political economy is maintained by a certain school of theoretical writers. It is contended by them, that restriction upon the importation of foreign commodities, under any circumstances, is a mistaken economy;—that foreign manufacturers should be allowed freely to bring in their wares, although they will receive from us nothing in exchange, but the precious metals. This is the system which has been lately called enlightened. We, on the contrary, believe it to be founded on mistaken views; and that a practical application of it would paralize the industry of the country. The fundamental principle in this system, is one which we deem totally erroneous. It considers the *profits of capital*, as constituting the only source of national wealth. It assumes the fact, that the wages of labour are barely sufficient to support the labourer, but leave him no-

thing for accumulation. Now, whether this may or may not be true, in the fully peopled countries of Europe, it is palpable to the slightest observation, that in reference to labour in the United States it is absolutely and totally false. Such is the abundance of the means of subsistence in this favoured country, that the labourer is able to accumulate capital out of his surplus earnings. We every where see capital accumulating in connexion with labour. Labour is not with us, as the theory supposes, the mere instrument of capital, the mere handmaid to furnish the profits of the capitalist; it is, on the contrary, an intelligent, active principle,—the partner and sharer in the increase of wealth produced by the united action of both. We have no class in America corresponding with the operatives,—the human machines of Europe. We, therefore, totally deny the correctness of the position, that "the question relates exclusively to the *application* of capital." We deny, that "the power of government is limited to its *transfer* from one employment to another." By increasing the stimulus to labour, resulting from the application of capital, to home production, additional capital *can* "be generated by an act of legislation." It is said, that this system "oppresses the many for the benefit of the few." We, on the contrary, believe, that whilst it benefits all, its highest recommendation is found in its beneficial action upon the many—the labouring classes, the working men. If there is any one principle in political economy, which is perfectly well established, it is, that the profits of capital, employed in any one branch of industry, cannot, for any length of time, exceed the average rate in other employments; it being the constant tendency of free competition to equalize profits. It is, therefore, an argument altogether fallacious to suppose, that this system favours capital devoted to one branch of business more than that devoted to another; or benefits any one class of individuals, to the prejudice or exclusion of others.

It is also said, that "it is equally untrue that such a system gives greater employment to labour."

We dissent from this doctrine, and are fortified by the opinion of the author of "The Wealth of Nations," whose language we think it useful to quote: "The capital of the manufacturer," says this writer, "puts immediately into motion a much greater quantity of productive labour, and adds a much greater value to the land and labour of the society, than an equal capital in the hands of any wholesale merchant."—"After agriculture, the capital employed in manufactures puts into motion the greatest quantity of productive labour, and adds the greatest value to the annual produce. That which is employed in the trade of exportation has the least effect of any of the three."—"The capital employed in the home trade of any country will generally give encouragement and support to a greater quantity of produc-

tive labour, in that country, and increase the value of its produce more than an equal capital employed in the foreign trade of consumption, and the capital employed in this latter trade has, in both these respects, a still greater advantage over an equal capital employed in the carrying trade." "That part of the capital of any country which is employed in the carrying trade is altogether withdrawn from supporting the productive labour of that particular country to support that of some foreign countries."

In accordance with these positions, we maintain the efficiency of labour to add to the power and riches of a country, against the theories of later writers who attribute every thing to capital. In fact, we consider it the most important and valuable feature in our system, that it tends directly to increase the effective power and remuneration of labour, thus multiplying the means, the comforts and enjoyments, of the labouring classes, and raising them in the scale of civilization and social life. This political effect on the character of society may be considered its highest recommendation. It is thus made to give strength and permanency to our free institutions.

The peculiar advantage of the United States consists in the abundance and cheapness of fertile lands, affording an easy subsistence and high remuneration to labour.—We consider the system of establishing manufactures and the arts amongst us, as distributing and equalizing these peculiar advantages, through all the departments of industry and through all classes of society.

This effect, we believe, to be deducible from the system, according to the most approved principles of political economy. But we consider all speculation on this subject, founded on the ultimate tendencies of human action and the averages of contending principles, as very uncertain guides in legislation, compared to the surer test of experience, and those practical results which are obvious to the senses.

Mistaken and preposterous assumptions of the merits of what is called Free Trade have, under the ever active delusion of British influence, afforded pretexts latterly to the opponents of the protective system, which it is proper to dispel. It is not long since no one believed in the power of propelling boats by steam, and every one believed that the British debt was to be paid off by the sinking fund;—similar mistakes exist as to Free Trade—As a municipal principle, there is no question of the great advantages of Free Trade. The United States, in their coasting trade and domestic exchanges, afford the most striking illustrations of them ever witnessed—but, as between foreign nations, there is no free trade—there never was—there never can be—It would contravene the arrangements of Providence, which distribute mankind into different communities, separated originally by confusion of tongues, and prevented from all rushing together into the most fa-

vored latitudes, by local attachments and foreign antipathies, which are the germs of national preservation, by means of national emulation.

Much of the suffering which it is alleged is felt in certain portions of the United States (if their complaints have, in fact, any foundation) is to be attributed to the very circumstance that they are placed in the circle of twenty-four commonwealths, enjoying the most complete freedom of trade, the operation of which has been to expose those who have not the inclination to employ their labour to the full extent of its capacity, to the severe rivalry of more industrious and thrifty communities, living under the protection of the same general government.

Nations are adversary to each other; their commercial intercourse is regulated by treaties always made with a view to relative advantages, and to provide for those hostilities which are of perpetual recurrence. The vexatious provincial tariffs which formerly fettered intercourse and almost destroyed traffic in the interior of nations, suggested the idea of that free trade, which has since been misunderstood and egregiously misapplied by mere speculative writers—The tariff acts, which even now impose duties on the wines of Spain at provincial borders and on those of France at city gates, are grievances, for which free trade is a happy substitute—but the principle is entirely municipal and in no respect applicable, without disadvantage, to independent nations.—The vessels of the United States are navigated with fewer hands and make their voyages in shorter periods, than others;—hence, what is called the reciprocity principle, originating in the first treaty between the United States and France, has been wisely proffered by the United States to many other nations, because it is supposed that our navigation would supplant theirs.—But the artificial systems of England, France, Spain and the other nations with which the United States have most intercourse, render it extremely improbable that any approximation to the footing of free trade should ever be arranged between them, even by treaty. For us to attempt while they reject it, would be a complete surrender of ourselves as a voluntary sacrifice to the policy and cupidity of foreign governments; to create a government for the benefit of others and not for ourselves. A tariff of duties on commerce between New-York and New-Jersey would be as injurious as unconstitutional. Free trade between these states and among all the states of the Union is the main spring of general welfare—and one of the strongest links of the chain that connects them; but free trade between New-York and Liverpool would ruin the farmers of England through our superabundant bread-stuffs, and the manufacturers of the United States by the superior capital and proficiency of England in manufactures, and the degraded state of the operatives. An unrestricted intercourse between two nations reduces the labour of one to the same scale of compen-

sation with the labour of the other; and such a consequence is certainly to be deprecated by that nation whose labour stood highest on the scale. This consideration forms a striking argument against the policy of such a system between foreign states.—While, on the other hand, it is no less desirable that, amongst the separate communities associated under the same government, this reduction of the higher labour to the scale of the lower should take place, inasmuch as the interests of these domestic communities are equally the objects of the protection and solicitude of their common governors.

The freest of free trade is, after all, but a chartered libertine.—The United States could not share their coasting trade with England without disadvantage:—the most extravagant advocates of free trade (it is believed) have never yet dreamed of sharing our river trade with foreigners.—To throw open the Ohio and Mississippi, the Hudson and the Delaware to British, French and Dutch navigation, would be of no advantage to our own.—England could not open her maritime coal trade, the great nursery of her seamen, to the enterprise of New England without losing at least one half of it.—She even refuses us a passage through the St. Lawrence, although we own part of that river. The greatest commercial nations of the middle ages, the Hanseatic League, and Holland, the maritime wonder of the world, became such by the exclusive enjoyment of the fisheries and the trade to India and other monopolies, which they maintained at the charge of long and bloody wars.—England struck the vital blow at Holland, not so much by naval victories as by her navigation act. The commercial and the military marine of the United States have risen to eminence upon similar interdiction.—With free trade we should have neither the one nor the other, but be a poor, dependent, pastoral people—It is only about ten years since a project for reducing the duties was first suggested in England, in a petition to Parliament from the merchants and traders of London.—In 1825 some slight and cautious reductions were accordingly made, but in nothing to affect the commercial monopoly and maritime ascendancy of Great Britain. Her colonial commerce is mostly exclusive.—The freedom of the trade of the Susquehanna river is now in dispute between the states of Maryland, Pennsylvania and New-York. So intractable is free trade in fact, while fruitful of speculation. Within a few years Russia, misled by this delusion, and Holland under the influence of England, made experiments of free trade, which Russia soon found intolerable and abandoned, and which has contributed to reducing Holland from once being the richest nation of Europe to being one of the most impoverished and indebted. In fine, the dogmas of free trade, which are said to be taught in some colleges, may serve to inflame youthful imaginations, but, as they have never actuated a practical statesman, they can never mislead any well-informed mind. What is

called the American System, is the system of Europe; is the universal system;—and (if the experience and common sense of mankind be any standard of right) is the true and the only system of intercourse among nations.

It is doubtless true, that during the last half century, a more enlightened philosophy has been applied to the affairs of mankind; that political economy is much better understood, its principles more fully developed, and more judiciously applied. The sense and experience of men had gone far to correct the erroneous legislation of former times, and to develope and multiply the true sources of national wealth. But the modern theory is not content with the attainment of practical benefits merely; it seeks, by an unqualified application of certain general principles, to produce a thorough revolution in the business of men and the relations of nations. It is against these extremes of visionary good and practical mischief, that we desire all men of reflection and sober judgment to make a stand. We ask them to look at the present condition of our country and to examine the operation of the present system upon all its great interests. Above all, we ask them to look to the practice of all foreign nations, rather than to the speculations of their writers. They will then find that those who have taught us this theory of free trade, are too wise to practise it; that they continue to act and to legislate upon the system of protecting their own industry, though some of their writers and orators recommend to all other nations to abandon it.

A reference to our own experience is, however, the best criterion, by which to test the correctness of the system which we support. It is not new; the principle was applied, as we have already stated, to our navigation, from the establishment of the Federal constitution, prohibiting foreign shipping from the coasting trade altogether, and imposing a high discriminating duty on foreign tonnage. If this discrimination has been abandoned, in respect to those nations, who would consent to a system of reciprocity, it involves no surrender of the principle. Trade can only be carried on between nations by mutual agreement; and mutual protection leads to reciprocity as the only equitable arrangement. The mechanic arts have also been the subject of protection from the establishment of the government; and it cannot be doubted that to this circumstance they owe, in a great measure, their success; a success, which has made the mechanics of the United States one of the main pillars of our national strength. Agriculture has likewise had a full share of the benefit of this protection; and in truth it may be said, that as our government commenced its career with the establishment of the germs of the protective system, so it has continued ever since, gradually nurturing and invigorating them until they have reached their present growth. Some interruptions have occurred in the march of this policy, but these interruptions owe their origin to accidental circumstances which dic-

tated the necessity of relaxing the system for the benefit of other interests that were more immediately concerned in availing themselves of the advantages of foreign trade. These, however, are to be regarded not as proofs of the uselessness of the system, but as exceptions growing out of the pressure of temporary accidents. The events that followed the French revolution gave a new and unexpected direction to the enterprise of our citizens. The disturbed state of the continent of Europe, and the prevalence of universal wars, throughout the nations of that quarter of the globe, placed the United States in the position of the only neutral amongst many belligerents, and so obviously opened the way to commercial wealth to our citizens, that all other interests sank into insignificance compared with those which were concerned in pushing a foreign commerce into every region where the strife of the contending parties excluded the competition of the belligerents themselves, and left to the United States the undisputed monopoly of trade. To this fortunate conjuncture of circumstances is to be ascribed the most rapid growth that has ever been traced in the history of any empire. The United States not only became the medium of the commerce of the world, but their peaceful position attracted the emigration of all those who had the means and the wish to escape from European troubles.

Amongst the advantages which have resulted to us from this state of things we have suffered one evil, the effect of which is not obliterated, even at this day. Accustomed for twelve or fourteen years to commercial speculations of unparalleled activity and success, we were taught to think that our national prosperity was inseparably connected with the prosecution of that kind of trade in which our citizens had been engaged, and we were thus insensibly educated in the opinion that the great interests of our commonwealth would be always concerned with a foreign commerce exclusively employed in transporting abroad the products of our agriculture and receiving returns in the manufactured commodities of other nations.

There was another circumstance that gave great authority to this delusion. The cotton manufacture of Great Britain was rapidly arising into the greatest activity and vigour. It was in process of time discovered that the raw material for this manufacture could be produced in the United States under more favourable circumstances than in any other part of the world. At first, but two or three of our states were employed in the cultivation, and the demand from England was even greater than the supply. The profits of this cultivation, therefore, were almost unlimited. The portions of territory employed in the growing of cotton were small, and the common opinion was that but few districts, in comparison with the great extent of our surface, could be appropriated to the culture. In the meantime, the cotton fabrics were diffused over Europe and took the place of large quantities of

those manufactured from wool, silk and flax. Every year demonstrated the increasing importance of this manufacture both in Europe and America, and the demand still continued to outrun the supply. These circumstances had their influence in impressing upon our citizens an exaggerated idea of the permanence and value of this source of agricultural wealth and, along with it, the value of the trade which was concerned in the transportation of it. It persuaded our planters to believe that they possessed an almost inexhaustible source of riches: it unfitted them for sober calculations upon the effects that would follow the extension of the culture of cotton over the fertile regions that yet lay in wilderness behind them: and it equally disinclined them to foresee the possibility of the manufacture itself reaching a term at which it might become stationary and which was, therefore, eventually to set a limit upon the demand, at the very period when the supply would be increased in an almost infinite ratio by the spread of population over other states of our union, even more propitious than their own to the production of the plant. It may, therefore, be considered a misfortune, consequent upon their former prosperity, that our citizens were almost irresistibly led by it into delusive estimates of the true and permanent sources of national wealth. It was one result of this state of things that, whilst our countrymen were intent upon gathering the harvest which the distracted condition of the world had strewn before them, they were unmindful of the future and neglected to treasure up the elements of strength and prosperity which lay hidden in the bosom of the nation; and which, as they were independent of foreign legislation or external accidents, were most likely to furnish the means of a stable and enduring happiness.

Troubles soon afterwards broke out at home. A war threatened and our citizens were suddenly called to meet a tremendous emergency. Our commerce was put in fetters by non-importation acts and embargoes; and the crisis that succeeded found us without the most ordinary resources of an independent people. Our armies went to the frontier clothed in the fabrics of the enemy; our munitions of war were gathered as chance supplied them from the four quarters of the earth; and the whole struggle was marked by the prodigality, waste and privation of a thriftless nation, taken at unawares and challenged to a contest without the necessary armour of a combatant.

When it pleased Heaven to rescue us from the imminent hazards of this doubtful and disproportioned conflict, we saw around us a nation of eight millions of people possessed of a territory nearly equal to the continent of Europe, rich in the ungathered resources of every kind of wealth,—just emerging from a war of two years and a half, with an enemy who had never assembled an army of more than thirty thousand men—and yet deranged

in all its channels of industry, exhausted, and on the verge of bankruptcy. Nothing but the most perverse neglect of the fundamental precepts connected with the proper administration of the concerns of a commonwealth could have produced such a result!

These disasters opened our eyes to some important facts. They demonstrated to us the necessity of extending more efficient protection, at least, to those manufactures which were essential to the defence of the nation. They proved to us the value of a national currency, and the duty of protecting it from the influence of foreign disturbance: and, amongst other things of equal moment, they made us acquainted with the fact that the British manufacturers could find a large and, if necessary, a complete supply of cotton from other soils than our own.

All these matters came into review before Congress at the close of the war. A proper occasion for their discussion arose when the question was submitted as to the reduction of the war duties. The return of peace made it necessary for the legislature to take off the taxes that had been imposed for defraying the expenses of the war; and in this reduction of duties to what it was considered should be a permanent standard, the cotton planting interest urged with great force and propriety, the necessity of retaining such a duty as should exclude from the American market all fabrics made from the cotton of the East Indies. It was an anomaly apparent to every citizen of the United States, that our government, possessing so many facilities for supplying Europe with cotton, should, nevertheless, allow a trade that threw in upon us vast quantities of cotton cloth produced at the distance of ten thousand miles: that our most common household supplies should be furnished from such a quarter. Nothing was more generally acknowledged than the duty of the government to protect the cotton grower against such a competition; and this argument was addressed to the nation by the cotton growing states, even with the conviction, at that time prevalent amongst themselves, that its success would be to give them what may be termed a species of monopoly in the supply.

The duty was retained; and it is important to know that, being designed for the protection of the cotton grower, it was graduated to a scale precisely adequate to that purpose. *His* interest required the exclusion of the East India fabric, but was supposed to be hostile to the attempt of the American citizen to manufacture the material: the duty, therefore, was adapted to the first purpose, but not to the latter. It banished the foreign manufacture:—it did not protect the home;—being thus accurately adjusted to the wants and wishes of the planting interest, without professing to serve any other.

This placed our commerce upon the most favourable footing for the co

ton grower that could be desired; and the nation, having thus performed its duty to this valuable interest, turned its attention to other branches of industry.

The Tariff of 1816, it may be remarked, was a measure that met the approbation of the large majority of the people in every section of the union. No partial nor local considerations were embodied against the operation of either its principles or policy. The southern states were even more forward than their northern confederates in recommending the policy and defending it in the councils of the nation. By this tariff various manufactures were attempted to be established in the United States. The want of skill and capital exposed these infant institutions to a fierce and vindictive competition from the manufacturers of Great Britain; and, in three years, almost every capitalist who had ventured into this field of enterprise was broken up. The heavy loss and distress that visited this endeavour to establish manufactures subsequently urged the subject of more extended protection upon Congress, and the result, after various struggles, close and elaborate inquiry and a careful attention to the expanding means of the country, was the establishment of a vigorous system, which has diffused health and strength into the industry of the nation, and added to the wealth of every class of the community.

We ask attention to another topic. Revulsions in trade are unavoidable: the balance of supply and demand cannot always be regulated with precision. There is a tendency, growing out of a prosperous commerce, to push success to an extreme which produces reaction. To these periods of embarrassment, of general stagnation, and severe pressure for money, the United States have been peculiarly subject.—We attribute this, in a great measure, to our having depended, in so great a degree, for our manufactures, upon the nations of Europe. Importation is induced more frequently by the necessity or hope of the manufacturer to find a market, than by actual reference to the wants or means of the country. A reduction in the prices of exports, following an excessive importation, causes a state of exchange which leads to an exportation of specie; the moment this exportation touches that portion of the precious metals necessary to sustain the money circulation, the operations of the banks become embarrassed, and distress and dismay are spread through all classes of the community.

We believe that the system which furnishes a nation with manufactures, essential to its daily wants, from its own industry, is the best possible security against violent changes in its currency;—changes which paralize all industry, and disturb all trade; and we therefore submit it to the experience and judgment of the American people whether the protective system is not, in this particular, more advantageous to the country than that which,

after deluging our markets with foreign manufactures, draws from us, in return, not a useless commodity, but the instrument by which our exchanges are performed, the very basis of our bank circulation, the essential principle of commercial confidence.

Mistaken opinions in regard to the effect of the tariff upon the prices of commodities used in the United States and upon which the protective system has been brought to bear, have furnished some popular objections against the wisdom of the policy. It has been said that the effect of a duty is necessarily to increase the price of any article upon which it is laid to the full amount of the tax. It would be easy to show, by a minute survey of the whole field of American industry, that, so far from this being true, the invariable operation of the tariff has been to lower the price to the consumer of every article that has been successfully manufactured under the protection. Such a survey would require more detail than the purpose of this address allows, but we propose to examine the operation of the tariff upon some of our most important staples.

In the article of cotton it is admitted that our manufacture has arrived at such perfection in the production of the coarse fabrics, that they are not only furnished at little more than one half of the cost which the imported articles of the same kind bore a few years ago, but they are produced as cheaply at the present time as our foreign rivals, under all the excitements of American competition, are able to furnish them. They have had a constant and increasing demand for several years for exportation as well as for home consumption. None but the finer qualities are now imported, which are little, if at all affected by the minimum duty. The price of raw cotton has fallen but about a cent a pound within the last four years, whilst the price of cotton goods,—of sheetings, for instance, of more than three yards to the pound,—has fallen nearly four cents a yard within the same period. Satinetts, of wool and cotton, are made at less than one half the price of cassimeres, and are more durable. Cotton flannels formerly imported from China at from fifty to sixty cents a yard, are now made, of a better quality, here, at from fifteen to twenty cents. Indeed we might enumerate every species of manufacture in which this material enters as a component part, to show that both in the character of the article and the cheapness of its price, the country has been a great gainer since the enactment of the system that has promoted its fabrication.

To the cotton planters of the United States, the system has undoubtedly yielded the most decisive advantages. It has created a certain and valuable market for about one-fifth of their crop, and it has encouraged the consumption of large quantities of their staple in fabrics to which it never would have been applied, if the manufacture had not been carried on in

our own country. The establishment of cotton mills amongst us has had the most visible tendency to induce our manufacturers to apply cotton to uses which both the policy and the position of foreign manufacturers would have forever forbidden them from adopting. This fact is conspicuously seen in the application of cotton to sail cloth, and to all those articles of heavy clothing in which it has lately been substituted for wool. It is now manufactured into carpets, blankets, cordage, twine, net work and a variety of other commodities that may be said to be exclusively of American origin. Cotton being a product of our own soil, we have naturally an interest to extend its application to new uses, above what might be expected from nations who are mere purchasers of the article, and who are as much, if not more, concerned in preserving and promoting the use of wool and hemp in the fabrics to which we have applied our cotton.

Let us next consider the article of Iron; and we will introduce the notice of it with a quotation from that masterly report of the first Secretary of the Treasury, which, forty years ago, recommended prohibitory duties in favor of the manufacturers of this article: "for" says that report, "they are en- "titled to pre-eminent rank. None are more essential in their kinds, none "so extensive in their uses. They constitute, in whole or in part, the im- "plements or the materials, or both, of almost every useful occupation. "Their instrumentality is every where conspicuous. It is fortunate for the "United States that they have peculiar advantages, for deriving the full ben- "efit, of this most valuable material, and they have every motive to improve "it with systematic care. It is to be found in various parts of the United "States in great abundance, and of almost every quality; and fuel, the "chief instrument in manufacturing it, is both cheap and plenty." This report which is a treatise on Political Economy, at least equal to any thing that has appeared since its publication, states that the average price of Iron before the revolution, was about sixty-four dollars per ton, and that at the time of that report it was about eighty dollars. Soon after it appears to have risen to ninety-five dollars, and in 1814 was as high as one hundred and fifty dollars. After the ineffectual Tariff of 1818, which ruined numbers, induced by its vain protection to make investments in the manufacture of iron, it rose from ninety to one hundred and five dollars per ton. Under the influence of the duties of the acts of 1824 and 1828, it has declined to its present prices of from seventy-five to eighty-five dollars per ton, and there is every reason for the confident belief entertained, that if our own market be protected against the formidable and incessant endeavours of the British manufacturers to controul it, the price of iron will, before long, decline to from fifty to sixty dollars per ton. Such is the irrefutable proof of all recent experience.—Cut nails, which in 1816 sold for twelve cents

per lb. are now sold for less than half that sum, under the permanent security of five cents per lb. which has given our manufacturers their own market. "The United States, (says Hamilton's report before mentioned) "already in great measure supply themselves with nails. About one mil- "lion eight hundred thousand pounds of nails and spikes were imported in- "to the United States, in the course of the year ending the 4th of Septem- "ber 1790. A duty of two cents per lb. would, it is presumable, speedily "put an end to so considerable an importation. And it is in every view pro- "per that an end should be put to it."

Bar Iron which sold at Pittsburg in 1829 at $122, sells there now at $95. Castings which were $63 are now $50 per ton. Such are the practical results, proving the operation of the tariffs on the market for iron. The duty, by the law of 1816, was so inadequate as to cause nothing but ruin to those concerned and enhancement of price to the consumer. The act of 1818 was some amelioration; the acts of 1824 and 1828, which increased the duty, decreased the price. Hammered bar iron under a duty of twenty two dollars and forty cents a ton; is at a lower price than when under a duty of nine dollars a ton, and improved in quality from five to ten per cent. by the greater care and skill which more extensive investment has naturally created under more certain protection.—The efforts of the English manufacturers to destroy the American manufacture of iron, and possess themselves of our market, have occasioned extensive bankruptcies amongst them in England, and reduced the price of iron considerably below the cost of manufacture; insomuch that a convention of iron manufacturers, recently held there, resolved to reduce the quantity made twenty per cent. throughout the United Kingdoms. With the controul of our market they would infallibly regulate both the price and the quantity of the iron in this country—thirty-one establishments of which have appeared in Western Pennsylvania alone, since the last Tariff act.

The influence of protection upon wool, while it has been most beneficial upon the farming states, has had no tendency, that we are aware of, to injure the plantation states. The number of sheep in the United States is computed at about twenty millions: And their increase at about five millions since the act of 1828, which gave a great impulse to the stock. The farmers of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New-York and the other wool-growing states, have an interest in this national property, taken at fifty-five cents per lb., nearly equal to the capital of the plantation states in the cotton crop of this year, reckoning it at thirty millions of dollars. There is no doubt that, within three years to come, the farming capital in wool will be more valuable than the plantation capital in cotton. Without protect-

ing duties American wool would be reduced one-half in quantity and in price. The large flocks which now cover the immense and inexhaustible pastures of the United States, most of them more or less of the fine Spanish breeds, must be again slaughtered, as has been heretofore the case, for want of due protection, and this great capital in fleece sacrificed to that of cotton with enormous loss to one interest, and with no possible advantage to the other. For like every thing else, woollen goods have fallen from twenty to twenty-five per cent. since the last tariff. The immediate effect of that act, by calling a large number of additional clothiers into active enterprise, was to cause a decline in prices ruinous to many of those before engaged in the occupation Under the influence of the improvement in the price of wool, woollen manufacturers have rallied again, but, at least as respects them, the charge of monopolizing prices is a cruel mockery. The advantages of the Tariff, in its operation upon wool, have thus far been confined almost exclusively to the farming interest, the manufacturers have yet all their way to win, and the effect of that competition, which is the result of protection, cannot be known until it has had longer time for operation.

The finest cotton and woollen manufactures are not yet much made in the United States, but we may assert without fear of contradiction that nine-tenths of the American people, who do not affect foreign luxuries and fashions, may be clothed with woollen, cotton, fur and leather fabrics of their own country, better and cheaper, than either could have been obtained abroad if the tariff had never been enacted. The greatest mistakes prevail in this respect; it is continually said, that hats, coats, boots and other articles of dress are dearer here than elsewhere. Such is not the case with all those who are independent of foreign fashions. Those who enjoy superior wealth and study superior elegance, are at liberty to gratify their caprice, at that additional expense, which such a gratification costs in all countries—in none more than in Great Britain, where the opulent and noble are in the habit of paying more extravagantly for French, Asiatic and other luxuries, than some of our opulent citizens chuse to pay, in like manner, for luxuries imported from abroad.

Whilst we assert that it has been the effect of the protective system to benefit the consumers by giving them manufactures cheaper than they had them before, we are willing to admit that prices have had a correspondent fall in the same articles abroad; but this fall of price abroad has been the result of the competition of American labour. It is impossible to advert to the fact that the United States export to foreign markets six times the quantity of domestic manufactures that they exported in 1820, and at present furnish incomparably the largest share of the home demand, with-

out perceiving the tendency of such a competition to reduce the price of the same articles amongst all those nations who aim at supplying us.

But we hold it to be a common error to consider the comparative cheapness of the foreign and domestic commodity a test of the value of the system. Even if it were true that the domestic product were not reduced in price, and were to be procured only at a higher cost than the foreign, still the benefit of the system would be found in the fact that it enables the domestic consumer to afford the higher price for the manufacture, and thereby to furnish himself on better terms than he could have done when obliged to depend upon the foreign imported commodity—that, in other words, the increase of price, if it has taken place, cannot be called a tax upon the consumer, if the same system which has increased the price has also increased his means of paying it. That this increased ability to pay has occurred to a most beneficial extent, is evident in the invigorated condition of our agriculture in the last three or four years, during which period the value of the labour of the farmer, and with it the value of his land, it is well known, has risen some twenty or thirty per cent. This augmentation in the value of agricultural labour and capital can be ascribed to no other cause than to the increase of the manufacturing classes, and to the rapid growth of our home market under the protective system. During this period there have been no wars to create a demand abroad for our grain, but on the contrary, all the producing nations have been exerting their industry to the utmost, and maintaining a rivalry against our own citizens which would have visited them with the most disastrous consequences if they had not found a steady and valuable market at home. The fact, too, that agricultural products have risen whilst manufactured goods have fallen, furnish the best proofs that the fall of prices are to be mainly attributable to the competition of domestic labour.

The loudest complaints of oppression proceed from the South, particularly from South Carolina; but that these complaints are not owing to the tariff acts, is unquestionably proved by the fact, that their public press, their memorials to Congress, and other mediums of complaint, were as much burthened with them before those acts, as they have been since. In the acquisition of the extensive and fertile territories annexed to the United States by the purchase of Louisiana the lands and property of the plantation states could not fail to be depreciated, by a vast accession of lands, at least as fertile, for all similar purposes. But it is inconceivable how a steady market for at least two hundred thousand bales of cotton a year, liable to no fluctuation from foreign influence, can be injurious to the cotton growing states; and, certainly, if the inhabitants of the less exuberant and more industrious latitudes of the central and eastern states, were not,

from the influence of climate, or some other cause, less liable to excite ment and less addicted to complain than their southern brethren, they have had much greater cause for it.

The article of sugar is a production of the planting states receiving the full benefit of the protecting system. If any application of the system operate as a tax on consumption, it would apply to the duty on sugar. It is true, the cotton planters of South Carolina will not admit that protection to the cultivation of sugar is any offset to their own fancied oppressions; but it is apparent that the lands and capital devoted to the cultivation of the sugar cane, are so much of both withdrawn from the cultivation of cotton, relieving that culture from the effect of over production, the only evil which it has any reason to fear.

The bread stuffs, lumber, and nearly all the other staples of all the grain growing states are excluded from European markets by prohibitory duties. Whilst the export of cotton has quadrupled, that of breadstuffs has diminished in a much greater ratio with relation to the population of the states that produce them. If instead of spending their time in unavailing complaints, they had not conformed to circumstances, and turned their attention to manufactures, *their* grievances would have been infinitely greater than any of which the southern states have ever complained. Nothing could relieve the farming interests of the middle states but their own manufactures and the manufactures of the eastern states. They alone supply that market which Europe denies. In addition to the incalculable consumption of breadstuffs by the manufacturers of the grain-growing states, what is equivalent to a million of barrels of their breadstuffs is imported every year into the eastern states; a relief, without which, the susceptibility of these states would have been tried to a degree of endurance far beyond that exacted from their brethren of the south. It cannot escape observation, that while their sufferings are announced in most eloquent language, and in unintermitting remonstrance, yet there has been so little specification of the supposed causes, that it is denied by many, among themselves, that they suffer at all. There is even good reason to believe, that within the last five years, the interest on planting capital has been more productive to the owner, than the interest on the same amount of capital employed in manufactures.

The states of New-York, Pennsylvania and Ohio have invested a capital of enormous amount, which may be reckoned as at least fifty millions, within the last ten years, in what are called internal improvements, canals, rail-ways, and other facilities of transportation. This capital depends entirely upon domestic industry for its fruits. It would be a dead loss to the four millions of people who have expended it, and might as well be aban-

doned at once, without the protected products of domestic industry for its returns. Foreign commerce can yield it little or no service; and to destroy those guards which secure to it the home market, would be to render it altogether a useless expenditure. Foreign commerce would in this way lose also one of its most productive resources.

In our review of the operation of the tariff upon the various interests of the several states, it must never be lost sight of, that the one-fifth of the cotton crop which is consumed at home, for which we may estimate the sum paid at six millions of dollars, is, in the course of a very short time, worked up by manufacture to at least thirty millions of dollars, which is the worth of the raw material wrought into the various articles produced by manipulation: thus one-fifth of the crop of cotton manufactured becomes as valuable as the whole cotton crop, in the short space of six months after its purchase; and in the meantime diffuses competency and comfort amongst large numbers of the labouring classes of the community.

The policy of the protective system is happily and amply illustrated in the growth and prosperity of the United States. The union teems with proofs of its wisdom. All that Hamilton's masterly report predicted of its benefits, has been unfolded and is progressive beyond the most sanguine anticipation. All the objections refuted in his argument have disappeared in experience. The antagonists of the system not long since declared that it would infallibly diminish, if not destroy the revenue, and compel a resort to loans and taxes for the support of government: their present complaint is that the revenue is excessive. Redundant importations, some years ago, imposed the necessity of a loan; the manufacturing establishments now spreading throughout the United States, sustain their agriculture, have revived their commerce, have vastly increased their coasting trade and domestic exchanges, and have mainly contributed to an abundance of the precious metals; they are the stablest pledges of independence and permanent peace, and the most accessible objects of taxation and productive resources in case of need. It was said that high duties would demoralize the commercial character of the United States, and the evils of smuggling are still insisted on and depicted in the most prominent colours. We know of no smuggling; nor do we believe that it exists to any considerable extent. It is true, frauds have been practised upon the revenue laws to a degree that demands the notice of government; but we are happy to have this opportunity to bear testimony to the high and honourable character of our merchants, and to say that where frauds have been discovered they ave had their origin with those who are alien to our clime, our laws, and all the considerations connected with our welfare. They are frauds that affect, comparatively, but a small portion of that vast amount of labour that owes its support to the protective system.

It was affirmed that this system would undermine commerce and ruin navigation; but they flourish and prosper beyond all expectation. It was to create a monied aristocracy: if aristocracy be possible with our institutions, it certainly has not found an abiding place amongst manufacturers. It was to inflict a class of paupers upon our population: no such class exists amongst the industrious. It is still denounced as taxing the many for the benefit of the few: but the many, with the power in their hands to change it, are its sturdy friends and supporters, proving that they, at least, deem themselves gainers by the system; whilst the few, on the other hand, never cease to tell us of the grievance of being subject to the majority.

A rapid increase of population, dwellings, culture, of the comforts of life and of the value of property, wherever manufactures prevail, bespeak their capacity to diffuse happiness and wealth. The new industry that has been brought into existence has induced the consumption of increased amounts of the productions of the land, and has added to the prosperity of every class of agriculturists. During the last six years; under the benefit of protection, four hundred sugar plantations have been added to the three hundred previously existing in the state of Louisiana, which now supplies two thirds of the demand of the whole union. In the meantime, the price has been continually falling, and there is every reason to believe that, within a short period, besides furnishing the home market, our planters will have a surplus for exportation.

Our warehouses, workshops, and stores, abound with excellent and elegant wares of American fabrication, almost excluding those from abroad. Silver and plated ware, the richest glassware, porcelain, household furniture and pleasure carriages, every article of woollen and cotton clothing, copper, brass and tin wares, hardwares, arms of all sorts, saddlery, and every thing else made of leather, drugs, paints and oils, tools, utensils, and implements of all sorts, every kind of machinery, from the smallest instrument of cutlery to a steam engine; nearly every thing that can be made of wood, iron, wool, cotton, glass, furs, the precious metals, whatever ministers to comfort, and most of the luxuries; all the substantial and ornamental means of habitation, subsistence, transportation by land and water, clothing and defence, are to be seen in every street, of every town, in every stage of process and transition, from the raw materials, which are abundant and excellent, to the removal of the finished article to distant places of purchase. The principal commerce among the several States of the Union is employed in the transportation of domestic manufactures, and managed by domestic exchanges, which have increased above all computation within the last few years. They insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, and promote the general welfare, by bonds stronger than any

political ties; infinitely stronger than armies or navies. Protection to these resources is, as it were, the Providence of our political being, ever guarding the industrious citizen, while adding to the nation's wealth. Without that Providence not a labourer, not an artizan, whatever his calling, but would be straitened and brought to ruin. Distress would be intense and universal. Stop the loom and the plough would work in vain; the ship would be unfreighted, and universal stagnation would succeed to the present healthful activity of our land. Is there an American who would raise his ruthless hand against the system which prevents such a calamity? who would recolonize his country from an unnatural disgust for its own productions, and morbid preference for those of Europe? who would bow before the woolsack of England, but spurn the golden fleece of his own soil?

Aversion to manufactures has engendered, of late, bitter local prejudices in parts of those states in which they do not flourish. Not long ago their promotion was in universal favour. When the venerable survivor of the framers of the constitution took the oath of fidelity to it, on commencing his illustrious presidency, the whole nation thought that he proved his patriotism by being clothed in a suit of American broadcloth. To doubt the constitutionality of protecting manufactures was not then conceived. Even to question the policy of promoting them was limited to very few. The statesmen and the patriots of the south were among the foremost to vindicate both.

The general pacification of 1815 exposed our market to the overwhelming force of English capital and skill, with more fearful odds than we had to contend against in the hostilities then closed with Great Britain. The inflexibility of her restrictive system, and the exuberant resources of our own country for manufactures, alone enabled us to withstand the great influx of her fabrics, and constrained us to protect our market by that system which has led to our present prosperity. Is it the cotton growing states who would subvert this prosperity and lay us once more prostrate before the power of our rival? Those states who, for the article of cotton, enjoyed a duty which did not merely *promote* but absolutely *created* its culture? a tax upon all the other states, which was represented as a grievance by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury in the very infancy of our government? a tax which diverted labour and capital into new channels for the exclusive benefit of those states, at the expense of all the rest? a tax which had not the remotest connexion with the revenues of the country, but was imposed merely for protection? Is it, above all others, the state of South Carolina that can complain of a protective impost, while she enjoys a heavy duty on indigo, which she has ceased to produce, and which therefore all the manufacturing states pay under circumstances aggravated by the

fact, that while they are obliged to submit to this tax on an article indispensable to their manufactures, the very state, for whose benefit it was imposed, declines to cultivate the article?

By a special resolution of this convention, an inquiry was directed into the moral influence of our manufactures;—in compliance with which we feel authorized to say, in a word, that the imputations sometimes cast upon the morals of manufacturing communities have proved, according to the experience of this country, to be without the slightest foundation. On the contrary, it is believed that the moral and religious education of those employed in manufactures is, at least, equal, if not superior, to that of other classes of the community.

In concluding this address we would take occasion to observe that the present posture of the affairs of the United States impress upon us the necessity of declaring what we believe to be the sentiment of the friends of American industry, in reference to a great question which must, in a short time, occupy the attention of Congress. Up to this period, the revenue of the government has not exceeded its wants. The debt has required a system of duties that would supply at least ten millions of dollars every year towards its extinguishment. That debt, under the present course of liquidation, will soon cease to exist. The nation will then naturally expect some reduction of duties. Participating in the common feeling on this subject, we cannot close this address without respectfully submitting to public consideration the expediency of applying that reduction to such commodities as are incapable of being brought within the scope of the protective system; holding it, as we do, to be indispensable to the best interests of the American people that that system should be sustained and preserved, without diminution, in its application to every branch of domestic industry that may be benefited by its influence.

Thus, fellow-citizens, we have submitted to your consideration our views of the construction of the constitution upon the great question of protection. If it be the true one, you will sanction and sustain it: if it be otherwise, let it be rejected; for the constitution is the supreme law.

We have also submitted our view of the true policy of this country. We have stated and urged those principles, on which the system of protection rests, which we believe to be supported by the maxims of a sound philosophy, the experience of mankind and our own. It remains with you to determine, whether that system of protecting your own industry, under which you have long advanced and are now prospering, shall be continued or abandoned; whether you will hold fast to that which your experience has proved to be good, or yield yourselves the victims of rash and untried theory. That nearly five hundred of your fellow-citizens should con-

vene, from sections of the country more than five hundred miles apart, to consult on these engrossing subjects, is itself an argument of the deep solicitude felt by the country at large in their discussion. To have separated without vindicating them, would have been a desertion of the trust committed to us. Their importance required that fullness of consideration which an enlightened and reflecting people have a right to demand. It has been our study to adhere to the utmost accuracy in our statement of facts, and to exercise the most perfect candour in our arguments. We therefore invite the strictest scrutiny to what we thus submit; whilst we are sensible that, with the advantage of more time than the session of the convention has afforded, it might have been presented in a more finished form. Deeply impressed with the gravity of the subject and the momentous aspect of our national concerns, we trust that our language has never departed from that tone of conciliation which becomes citizens of the same country differing from their brethren upon great questions of national policy.

But let us bear constantly in mind that the union, the happiness, the peace and the power of our beloved country depend on its domestic industry, without which these United States would cease to be an independent nation.

Let those who acknowledge this great bond of union never forget that "united we stand and divided we fall;" that sugar, and iron, hemp and lead, wool and cotton, and the other productions of our diversified soil, elaborated by our own indefatigable industry, and protected by our own free government, are, in effect, the government that holds us together, and make us one people; that the home market is the palladium of home itself in all its most endearing and ennobling political and social relations; without which we have no common country, but should be reduced to the condition of dismembered and defenceless provinces. Let it therefore be the instinct of all who acknowledge its cause as their own, to stand together, like the fathers of the revolution; with no local jealousy, no impolitic preference of one part of our system to another, but maintaining a united and inflexible adherence to the whole.

Spontaneous conventions like the present originated our glorious revolution and our admirable constitution. May the Almighty Power that presided over their deliberations, and that has never yet failed to guard these United States, shed the gracious influence of his protection upon our labours!

WILLIAM WILKINS, of Pennsylvania, *President.*
JAMES TALLMADGE, of N. York, } *Vice Presidents*
GEORGE BLAKE, of Massachusetts, }
HEZEKIAH NILES, of Maryland, }
JOSHUA W. PEIRCE, of N. H. } *Secretaries.*
CHARLES PAINE, of Vermont, }

MAINE.

Joshua Wingate, Jr. Portland
Israel Ilsley, do.
Moses Emery, Saco
Josiah Calef, do.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

Samuel Grant, Walpole
Lloyd W. Wells, Somersworth
Joseph W. March, Portsmouth
John Williams, Dover
Robert Lefavour, Portsmouth
Joshua W. Peirce, Somersworth
John B. Wheeler, Orford
Ebenezer Lord, Portsmouth
Walter Tufts, Alstead
David Culver, Lime
Jeremiah Wilson, Gilmanton
Wm. Palmer, Dover
Saml. Garfield, Jr. Langdon
Thos. Woolson, Claremont
Richard Bartlett, Concord
Robt. Rice, Portsmouth
Nathl. Gilman, Exeter
Richard R. Waldron, Portsmouth
Thos. Nesmith, Derry
John Cavender, Franklin

VERMONT.

Martin Chittenden, Williston
Charles Paine, Northfield
Heman Allen, Burlington
Isaac N. Cushman, Hartland
Francis Slason, Rutland
Thomas Hammond, Orwell
Charles H. Hammond, Bennington
Mark Richards, Westminster

MASSACHUSETTS.

Warren Dutton, Boston
Patrick T. Jackson, do.
Israel Thorndike, Jr. do.
Jos. T. Buckingham, do.
Abbott Lawrence, do.
D. D. Broadhead, do.
Theo. Lyman, Jr. do.
Isaac C. Pray, do.
Jas. T. Austin, do.
George Blake, do.
Edward H. Robbins, do.
Charles Wells, do.
Stephen White, do.
Jonas B. Brown, do.
Wm. Appleton, do.
Martin Bates, do.
Robert Rogerson, do.
Willard Phillips, Boston
Robert G. Shaw. do.
Alex. H. Everett, do.
John Hooper. Marblehead
Stephen C. Phillips, Salem
E. S. Rand, Newburyport
William Sutton, Danvers
Nathaniel Saltonstall, Salem
Samuel Hoar, Concord
William Parmenter, East Cambridge
Nathan Crosby, Newburyport
Charles Stearns, Springfield
Henry K. Newcomb, Greenfield
James Richardson, Dedham
John Lemist, Roxbury
Luther Metcalf, Jr. Medway
Samuel Crocker, Taunton
John A. Parker, New Bedford
Shepard Leach, Easton
Jas. C. Starkweather, Pawtucket
Aaron Tufts, Dudley
Nathl. P. Denny, Leicester
Rejoice Newton, Worcester
B. Taft, Jr. Uxbridge
Jonas L. Sibley, Sutton
John Milton Earle, Worcester
Joseph Lyman, Northampton
Henry W. Dwight, Stockbridge
Henry Shaw, Lanesborough
Lemuel Pomeroy, Pittsfield
Joseph Merrick, do.
William Lawrence, Boston
Ebenezer Chadwick, do.
Ezra Dyer, do.
Amos Binney, do.
Benj. W. Crowninshield, Salem
Wm. P. Endicott, do.
Russell Brown, Cheshire
John Mills, Southwick
Joel Norcross, Monson
Edmund Burke, North Adams
Danl. P. Merriam, do.
Isaac U. Hoxie, Adams
Elnathan Jones, Enfield
John Wyles, Brimfield
Horatio Lyon, Monson

RHODE ISLAND.

George Irish, Middletown
Samuel F. Gardner, Newport
Chris. E. Robbins, do.
Edward Carrington, Providence
Zach'h Allen, do.

Saml. F. Mann, Providence
Stanford Newell, do.
Wm. E. Richmond, do.
Benj. Cozzens, do.
Matthew Watson, do.
Geo. Baker, do.
John Whipple, do.
Stephen Waterman, do.
Joshua Maaran, do.
Chas. Jackson, Scituate
Jas. F. Simmons, Johnston
Wm. Rhodes, Warwick
Nathan F. Dixon, Westerly
Peleg Wilbur, Jr. Coventry
Chas. Eldridge, E. Greenwich
John Allen, Centreville
Stephen Steere, Smithfield
Wm. A. Robinson, South Kingston
Willet Carpenter, North Kingston
Nathan M. Wheaton, Warren
John Howe, Bristol
Jas. D'Wolf, do.
Nathl. S. Ruggles, Newport
Rich'd Anthony, North Providence
Wm. Field, do.

CONNECTICUT.

David Kimberly, New Haven
Thos. G. Woodward, do.
Nathl. R. Clark, do.
Wm. W. Boardman, do.
Leverett Griswold, do.
Sidney Babcock, New Haven
Joseph Fairchild, do.
Hosea Hinsdale, Winchester
Theodore Hinsdale, do.
Thomas Watson, Jr. New Hartford
Alanson Hamlin, Bridgeport
Edwin Porter, do.
Fitch Wheeler, do.
Saml. B. Sherwood, Saugatuck
William H. Jessup, do
Ebenezer Jessup, do.
Timothy T. Merwin, Norwalk
Algernon E. Beard, do.
Theodore Davenport, Stamford
Saml. P. Randall, Wilton
Starr Ferry, Bethel Office, Danbury
Samuel Raymond, New-Canaan
William Watson, do.
Joseph Barber, New Haven
Walter Booth, Meriden
Philip S. Galpin, New Haven
Edward S. Johnson, Stratford
John Mather, Manchester
Samuel D. Hubbard, Middletown
J. G. W Trumbull, Norwich
Calvin Goddard, do.
Dennis Kimberly, New Haven
J H. Deforest, Humphreysville
Robt. Watkinson, Hartford
Seth Marshall, Colebrook
Erastus Lyman, Goshen
John Isham, Canaan
Henry L. Ellsworth, Hartford
Isaac Kellogg, New Hartford
Benjamin Deforest, Watertown
Wm. C. Sterling, Salisbury
David C. Collins, Hartford
Wm. C. Gilman, Norwich
John Boynton, South Coventry
J. M. L. Scoville, Waterbury
Wm. Deforrest, do.
Russell Hoyt, Danbury
James Brewster, New Haven
John M. Holley, Salisbury
Henry Watson, East Windsor
E. S. Williams, Pomfret Landing
James Wolcott, Wolcottville
W. R. Taber, Bridgeport
David Holley, Stamford
Samuel Comstock, Norwalk
Oliver C. Sanford, Weston
John Hyde, Mystic
Walter Mitchell, Hartford
Henry S. Lee, Leesville
Joshua L'Hommedieu, Chester
G. D. Wadhams, Wolcottville

NEW-YORK.

John Woodward, New York
Robert Swartwout, do.
Martin E. Thompson, do.
Thomas Herttell, do.
Henry G. Guyon, do.
Clarkson Crolius, do.
James Lynch, do.
Thos. R. Smith, do.
Edwin Williams, do.
Wm. Stevens, do.
Nathaniel J. Boyd, do.
James Tallmadge, do.
Hector Craig, do.
Anson G. Phelps, do.
James B. Murray, do.
Charles A. Davis, do.

Augustus Greele, New York
Peter H. Schenck, do.
Joseph P. Simpson, do.
Jonathan Seymour, do.
James W. Robinson, do.
Jacob Acker, do.
Peter Sharpe, do.
Ralph Lockwood, do.
Silas Brown, do.
Erastus Ellsworth, do.
Elijah Paine, do.
Peter R. Livingston, Rhinebeck
William Davies, Poughkeepsie
Thomas Williams, do.
Morgan Carpenter, Stanford
Stephen Titus, Lagrange
Gilbert Brewster, Poughkeepsie
Bartow White, Fishkill
John C. Van Wyck, do.
William B. Leonard, do.
Walter Cunningham, Poughkeepsie
Robert Wilkinson, do.
A. L. Ulrich, Fishkill
Abraham Van Wyck, do.
Robert Tillotson, Redhook
Isaac Merritt, Dutchess
Thomas Taber, 2d. Dover
John T. Shryver, Rhinebeck
Michael Schultz, Monroe Works
Nathaniel P. Hill, Montgomery
David Corwin, Phillipsburg
John W. Knevels, Newburgh
Jesse Scofield, Walden
John J. Brooks, Blooming Grove
Nathaniel Dubois, Newburgh
James Wheeler, Warwick
Edmund Kirby, Brownville
Lovell Kimball, Watertown
Jesse Buel, Albany
Isaiah Townsend, do.
Benj. Knower, do.
Oliver Kane, do.
Bennington Gill, do.
Jeremiah H. Peirson, Rampo.
Abel French, Albany
Samuel S. Lush, do.
Ed. C. Delavan, do.
Egbert Egberts, do.
H. Ames, do.
Dav. E. Gregory, do.
Hy. G. Wheaton, do.
J. L. Rathbone, do.
Samuel M. Hopkins, do.
John T. Norton, Albany
John P. Beekman, Kinderhook
Peter Townsend, New-York
Daniel Ayers, do.
S. O. Almy, Le Roy
Jona. Child, Rochester
Harvey Lyon, do.
Elisha Johnson, do.
Eben. S. Beach, do.
Derick Sibley, do.
Barent Sanders, Schenectady
Henry Peck, do.
Gabriel Furman, Brooklyn
William D. Ross, Essex
Francis Sayre, Catskill
Geo. Tibbets, Troy
Richard P. Hart, do.
Geo. R. Davis, do.
Justus McKinstry, Hudson
Oliver Wiswell, do.
James Millen, do.
James Wild, Columbiaville
Abraham P. Holdridge, Spencer town
Charles H. Morrell, Ludlowville
Isaac B. Gere, Ithaca
David T. Tillotson, do.
Isaac Carpenter, do.
Gurdon Corning, Troy
Geo. M. Tibbitts, Hoosick
Richard J. Knowlson, Sandlake
Alonzo G. Hammond, Berlin
Claudius Moffatt, Stephentown
Gershom Turner, Nassem
Jacob P. Deforest, Greenbush
E. B. Shearman, Utica
Fortune C. White, Whitestown
Wm. Wolcott, do.
S. N. Dexter, Oriskany
Aaron Barnes, Utica
Jesse Ives, Whitestown
Wm. Williams, Utica
Montgomery Hunt, do.
Asahel Seward, do.
Abm. Varick, do.
James Dana, do.
A. B. Johnson, do.
Jos. L. Richardson, Auburn
Daniel Kellogg, Skeneateles
William Soper, jr. Milton
Effingham Lawrence, Flushing
Jos. L. Franklin, do.
Wm. R. Prince, do.
Benj. B. Howell, New-York

John Howell, Ulster
John Buckley, Marlborough
Isaac F. Haviland, N. Hempstead
Robert W. Mott, do.
Allen Thompson, Pine Plains
E. Tilden, New Lebanon
L. Stott, Hudson

NEW-JERSEY.

John Morrow, Paterson
Robert B. Campfield, Newark
John Taylor, do.
John Colt, Paterson
Mark W. Collett, do.
Stephen P. Brittain, Elizabethtown
John N. Simpson, Princeton
Robert Lee, Rahway
Wm. Edgar, do.
John S. Darsey, Hanover
John Vail, Paterson
Wm. W. Coriell, Elizabethtown
Henry D. Polhemus, Freehold
Jonathan Crane, Elizabethtown
Samuel G. Wright, Allentown
John Coryell, Lambertville
Thomas Capner, Flemington
Chas. C. Strattan, Swedesborough
Israel R. Clawsen, Woodstown
David Reeves, Bridgetown, W.N.J.
Wm. P. Robinson, Oxford Furnace
Edward Thomas, Medford
Robert E. Hornor, Princeton
William Tuttle, Newark
Abraham W. Kinney, do.
Caleb H. Shipman, do.
Isaac Andrus, do.
Stephen Dodd, do.
Asa Torry, do.
Ashbell W. Covy, do.
Wm. Jackson, Rockaway
Joseph Jackson, do.
Wm. Scott, Powerville
Jesse Richards, Evesham
George M. Maclean, Princeton
Abraham Cross, Newark
Jonathan Cory, do.
Henry A. Ford, Morris Town
Dayton I. Canfield, do.
Daniel Holsman, Paterson
Thomas Rodgers, do.
Joseph C. Hornblower, Newark
Samuel Swan, Bound Brook
Abraham Godwin, Jr., Paterson
Nicholas Smith, do.
Amzi Dodd, Newark
William Stevens, do.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Mathew Carey, Philadelphia
Daniel W. Coxe, do
A M. Jones, do.
Jesse R. Burden, do.
Edmund Green, Holmesburg
Ellis Lewis, do.
S. V. Merrick, Philadelphia
Wm. W. Young, do.
Samuel Breck, do.
John J. Borie, do.
B. W. Richards, do.
T. B. Darragh, do.
Charles J. Ingersol, do.
Joseph Howell, do.
Robert A. Parrish, do.
Lewis Waln, do.
P. A. Browne, do.
John White, do.
E. Roberts, do.
Samuel Richards, do.
Churchill Houston, do.
Bernard M'Credy, do.
J. Holgate, do.
Joseph Hemphill, do.
Mark Richards, do.
Nathan Bunker, do.
Alexander McClurg, do.
James Martin, do.
Thos. P. Hoopes, do.
John R. Coates, do.
J. P. Wetherill, do.
John S. Riddle, do.
Edward Coleman, do.
D. S. Hassinger, do.
Geo. Wilson, W. Alex. Wash. Co.
Thomas M'Giffin, Washington Co.
David Acheson, do.
Wm. Waugh, do.
Thomas Morgan, do.
Jonathan Roberts, Upper Merion
Richard B. Jones, Lower Merion
Mathew Roberts, Upper Merion
Joseph Engle, Chester
John Edwards, Ivy Mills, Del. Co.
Daniel Lammotts, Chester
J. M'Sherry, Petersburg, Adams Co.
Daniel M. Smeyser, Gettysburg
Joseph Williams, Somerset
Emanuel Shafer, do
Jacob M. Haldeman, Harrisburg

Alexander Cardon, Harrisburg
Walter S. Franklin, do
Geo. D. B. Kiem, Reading
Jacob U. Snyder, Oley Furnace
James L. Dunn, Reading
Simon Seifert, do
Daniel M. Keim, do
Wm. Wilkins, Pittsburg
Thos. Bakewell, do
Robt. T. Stewart, do
A. Brackenridge, do
Walter Forward, do
John M'Kee, do
James Sinton, Easton
Anthony M'Coy, Martin's Creek
Wm. Henry, Stroudsburgh
Hopewell Hepburn, Easton
E. Hunt, Brownsville, Fayette co.
Daniel Durkee, York co.
H. Y. Slaymaker, Margarretta furn.
James Humes, Lancaster
Wm. Coleman, do
Cyrus S. Jacobs, do
D. Jenkins, Churchtown, Lan. Co.
Samuel O. Jacobs, do do
David Mann, Bedford
Peter Schell, do
Abram. Kerns, do
Saml. M. Barclay, do
J. M'Ilvaine, Brandywine Manor, Chester Co.
David Potts, jun. Potts Town
Th. W. Langley, Warren, P. C.
Joshua Evans, Paoli
James Whitaker, Phenixville
Thomas Chambers, Chambersburgh
Hardman Phillips, Phillipsburgh
Geo. Valentine, Bellfonte
James Dunlop, Chambersburgh
Geo. G. Leiper, Leipersville
Samuel Edwards, Chester
John Dukeheart, Jr. Fallstown
Benjamin Reeves, Philadelphia
Thos. G. McCulloh, Reading
Wm. Maris, New-Hope
Mathias Morris, Doylestown
E. T. McDowell, do
John Britton, Brockin
Alfred Jenks, Bridesbury
Wm. Almond, Blockley
Samuel Kimmell, Stoystown

DELAWARE.

And. Gary, Newark, N. C. County
E. I. Dupont, Brandywine
Jacob Alrichs, Wilmington
John Gordon, do
Mahlon Betts, do
Philip Reybold, Delaware City
Wm. Kennedy, do

MARYLAND.

Luke Tiernan, Baltimore
John M'Kim, do
Hezekiah Niles, do
Lewin Wethered, do
Isaac Tyson, Jr. do
Hugh W. Evans, do
Thomas Ellicott, do
John P. Kennedy, do
Wm. W. Taylor, do
Christian Keener, do
James Williams, do
Colum. O'Donnell, do
John Kelso, do
Saml. D. Walker, do
Geo. Rodgers, do
Roswell L. Colt, do
John T. Barr, do
Hugh Boyle, do
Evan T. Ellicott, do
Jas. W. McCulloh, do
James Beacham, do
Shep. C. Leakin, do
John Wethered, do
Geo. Keyser, do
Horatio M'Pherson, Frederick
James M. Coale, do
John Brien, do
Wm. C. Johnson, Newtown, F. Co.
H. Ellicott, Patuxent Forge, A. A.
Jeremiah Hughes, Annapolis
P. Wethered, jr. Union House, Kent County
George Gale, do do
Simon A. Wicks, Chestertown
Jacob Mathias, Westminster

OHIO.

Geo. Endly, New Lisbon
Holland Green, do

VIRGINIA.

Wm. Lambdin, Wheeling
John McLure, do
M. Bruen, Kanawha

DISTRICT COLUMBIA.

Peter Force, Washington City

Sands & Neilson, printers, Baltimore.

GENERAL CONVENTION

OF THE

FRIENDS OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRY,

ASSEMBLED AT NEW YORK OCTOBER 26, 1831.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

ON THE PRODUCT AND MANUFACTURE OF IRON AND STEEL.

In Convention, Oct. 27.—It was resolved that a committee of fifteen be appointed to report on the production and manufacture of iron.

The committee was afterwards charged to report on the production and manufacture of steel, and enlarged. And, in its final arrangement, consisted of the following gentlemen:

Messrs. Dunlop, (chairman), S. Richards, Valentine, Jones, Haldeman, Stewart, Keim, Henry, Pennsylvania, J. Richards, Scott and W. Jackson, N. Jersey, Newell, R. Island, E. T. Ellicott, Boyle, Maryland, B. B. Howell, Murray, Ross, J. Townsend, New York, Holley, Connecticut, Leech, Massachusetts, Philips, J. R. Coats and Chambers, Pennsylvania, Hammond, Vermont, and J. H. Pierson, New York.

REPORT ON IRON AND STEEL.

The Committee on Iron and Steel respectfully Report:—

That in discharge of the duties assigned to them, they have availed themselves of the information obtained by the convention of the manufacturers of iron, recently assembled at Philadelphia (of which several of your committee were members), which information was originally collected for the purpose of answering the call made upon the secretary of the treasury, at the close of the last session of congress—and is, they have every reason to believe, as precise and accurate, in all its parts, as any body of facts, of equal magnitude and importance, which, under similar circumstances, has ever been submitted to the public.

From abstracts of statements made to that meeting [annexed and marked A] it appears that at 202 furnaces, known to have been in operation, there were made in the year 1830, 155,348 tons of iron. This iron, further investigation enables your committee to say, is converted into 90,768 tons of bar iron, and 28,273 tons of castings, as there also set forth, which with the

bar iron made at the bloomeries, amounting in that year to 5,853 tons, and making a total of bar iron of 96,621 tons, will, if estimated at the average wholesale prices of the principal markets of the country, as therein more particularly detailed, give an aggregate value for the production of that year of eleven millions, four hundred and forty-four thousand, four hundred and ten dollars.

The same statements exhibit for the three years ending with 1830, (when the bar iron made at the bloomeries is reduced to pig iron, and added to that made at the furnaces), the following results—

For	1828.	Iron	130,881	tons.	Value	10,861,440 Dollars.
"	1829.	"	142,870	"	"	11,528,134 "
"	1830.	"	163,542	"	"	11,444,410 "

Increase in quantity in two years very nearly 25 per cent.

Increase in market value not quite five and one half per cent.

It will be perceived in examining the last statement, that the increase in value does not keep pace with that of quantity—and your committee would here, for a moment, call the attention of the convention to this fact, to which they shall have occasion to allude more particularly hereafter, as affording a practical refutation of the doctrine, that an increased impost *necessarily* enhances the price to the consumer.

In this instance the average price of bar iron in 1828 was $118\frac{1}{3}$. In that year an addition to the duty on hammered iron was made of 4 40-100 per ton, and on rolled of 7 dollars. In the following year the price fell to 114 2-3, and in 1830 to 96 2-3; shewing a decline in two years of 21 2-3 dollars per ton, in the face of the increased duty above mentioned—a decline effected exclusively by domestic competition, inasmuch, (as will hereafter appear) no corresponding diminution of price took place abroad, and the fall here, was greatest in those markets which are inaccessible to foreign iron.

In making these statements, your committee have been careful to found them upon data which they believe will bear the test of the most rigid scrutiny. They have been particularly cautious to guard against exaggeration. They believe the cause they desire to sustain needs no aid beyond the simple truth, and, when that is made known it will require no extraneous support, but may safely rest its claims to the favour of their fellow citizens, upon *their* sense of justice and expediency, and *its own* intrinsic merits.

Notwithstanding their own convictions on this subject, however satisfactory to themselves these statements certainly are, yet, as they are so much at variance with others which, having been extensively spread before the public under the sanction of a select committee of the senate of the United States, are, on *that* account, entitled to the most respectful consideration,—your committee will, in this place, submit some additional facts and statements in proof of what they have already adduced.

In 1810 the quantity of bar iron made in the United States was, agreeably to Cox's tables, - - - - - Tons 27,051

This quantity was probably short of the truth, as the tables are known, when they err, to err in this particular, excess never having been attributed to them.

We have no account of the *quantity* imported before 1816. It was then, of *all* kinds of bar iron, agreeably to a return made by the register of the treasury, upon a call by congress. 21,537

tons. If the importation of 1810 be estimated at three fourths of that of 1816—it cannot be far from the fact, and would be 16,152

Giving a total for the consumption of 1810, of bar iron—*tons* 48,203

Our population was then seven millions—it is now thirteen. If the consumption of iron be estimated at only the same rate, it would require for the year 1830 - - - - - - - - - - 80,236 *tons.*

The importation of foreign bar iron for 1829, (the last return in possession of the committee) was 32,750—exported 260—for consumption - - - - - - - 32,490

Leaving a void to be supplied by the domestic article of 47,746 *tons.*

But if the consumption be estimated not only by the ratio of increase of the population, but also by that of the vast increase of every branch of industry requiring the use of iron, it cannot be doubted that the consumption of 1830 was fully three fold that of 1810; it is probable that it was even greater, but equal at that rate to 129,609 tons; from which deduct that part imported, estimated as of 1829, (from which it cannot materially vary), *and the result is* 97,119 *tons, instead of* 35,000 *tons,* as asserted in the statements referred to—corresponding in a remarkable manner (the difference being less than 500 tons) with the estimates of the committee founded upon the facts *now* collected; believed still to be under the truth, and shewing the extraordinary errors into which the most enlightened and intelligent may be betrayed, by adopting the *conjectures* of others without due investigation.

Your committee have already referred to the fact of the decline in the prices of iron from 1828 to 1830, as establishing the doctrine that a duty on a foreign article, which can be abundantly produced at home, does not necessarily enhance the price to the consumer. In further illustration of that part of the subject, and of other beneficial consequences flowing from the system of protection, they beg leave now to refer to the accompanying statements marked B and C. By the one it will be seen, that while iron in some foreign markets advanced from 40 to 50 per cent. from 1824 to 1825, and from 1822 to '25 experienced fluctuations amounting to nearly 75 per cent. on the lowest cost—our own varied but about 17 per cent. *including an additional duty of about five,* and actually receded at a subsequent period, although sustained by a second addition to the duty, to prices below what had prevailed ten years before, when the existing duty upon hammered iron was but nine dollars, or less than one half of that now levied.

This comparative stability, so important to the success of all well regulated industry, was due, exclusively, to the domestic supply, which effectually protected the consumer from the foreign speculator, who could otherwise have controlled this market, and produced here the same disastrous consequences that ensued in his own.

If such has been the result of protection upon the general market of the country, its effects have been still more striking, when examined with reference to particular, but most important districts. Our western brethren, the hardy pioneers of our country, were restrained and limitted, in their contest with the wilderness, by the difficulty of obtaining, on almost any terms, this article so indispensable to their success, in every stage of their arduous en-

terprise. The second statement exhibits the prices of iron of various descriptions at different periods, at Pittsburg and Cincinnati, the great marts of the west. Comment can scarcely be necessary upon the facts there disclosed. The decline in price (in some instances more than one half,) has been in exact proportion with the stability given to the domestic manufacture, by additional impost on the foreign, until it has reached a point that now enables the mechanics of the first mentioned city, that Birmingham of America, to enter into successful competition with those of almost any other quarter, in the fabrication of nearly every article of necessity, and in one, justly esteemed the proudest effort of human ingenuity, they have attained a degree of perfection which enables them to challenge comparison with the skill and experience of any nation whatever.

As your committee are assured that contracts can be made for any number of engines at the prices indicated in the table referred to, it cannot be necessary that they should press this point further.

Here, your committee might perhaps leave this branch of their subject, satisfied with having, as they believe, demonstrated, that protection to the manufacturer, when effectual in amount and connected with such an assurance of permanence as stimulates enterprise and excites skill, does not operate as a tax on the consumer, but the reverse. But they believe that facts will justify them in going even further; and will enable them to maintain the position, that an impost may, under some circumstances, operate as a tax, *not upon the consumer of the importing country, but upon the producer of the foreign article*, compelling him, for the purpose of preserving even partial possession of the market, to reduce his own profits in proportion to the increase of impost, which reduction is, in fact, a contribution to the treasury of the importing country, and may relieve its citizens from the burthen of taxation to that extent.

The circumstances under which this may occur are two.—First, where the importing country is the only or the principal market for the article in question, and that article one which the exporting country *unavoidably* produces in the manufacture of some other of greater value. Second, where there is an increasing surplus of production in the exporting country, and an extensive and growing manufacture of the same article in the country where this surplus has theretofore sought a market.

Without detaining the convention longer than to make a passing reference, as an example of the first case, to the additional duty laid by the tariff of 1828 (since repealed) upon molasses, which duty was exclusively paid by the foreign planter, who thus contributed, during its existence, more than half a million of dollars per annum to the support of the government of the United States,—the committee will proceed, in proof and illustration, at once of the second, again to refer to statement marked B, and to that marked D, where, among other facts, it will be seen, that in July 1828, after the intelligence of our additional duty reached England, iron fell at once 4 44-100 per ton, and that in the following year a further reduction of 6 50-100 was submitted to. Our additional duty gave additional confidence to the American manufacturer—he extended his operations and increased the supply, *without advancing the price*. The foreign manufacturer could only reach the market by the payment of the additional impost. American competition prevented him from charging this to the consumer and he was

therefore compelled to diminish his profits by this much, and to the same extent to become a contributor to the treasury of the United States.

An examination of the last mentioned statement [D] will shew that, by this means, through the instrumentality of American manufacturers, their foreign competitors have been made tributary to the public treasury, upon the article of iron alone since that article has been *really* protected, more than two millions and an half of dollars, while the consumer, as has been already shown, has been benefitted to an amount even greater than this.

If it be alleged that the same benefits would have resulted to the consumer—that the same decline in prices would have occurred without this competition—we answer, that such allegation would be contrary to all experience, which has taught all who have given attention to the subject, to know, that, while we are dependent, *exclusively*, upon foreigners for any article of consumption, they are enabled to prescribe their own terms, and that these always include a large profit to themselves. But the moment it is discovered that domestic ingenuity is at work to produce the same article, that moment their prices are reduced, and often to an extent that excites astonishment, when it is accompanied with the knowledge that no sensible change in the cost of production has taken place.

But it may be asked—if additional protection, by exciting domestic competition, invariably brings down prices, of what benefit is this protection to the domestic manufacturer? To this we reply—that *permanence* and *stability*, NOT *high prices*, are our objects. American manufacturers are not so blind to the constant and inevitable course of events, as not to foresee that, as these objects are approached, they must expect a more active competition from their fellow citizens, as well those who are already engaged in the same pursuits, as from others who may be induced to enter. But for this they are prepared—they can calculate its extent, and its effects are wholesome and salutary upon all. It stimulates to greater care, economy, industry and skill—profits are reduced, but they are stable; and the prudent man looks forward, with confidence, to realizing a fair reward for his labours. Against foreign competition there is no guarding, because the manner of its approach can never with certainty be foreseen, nor can its extent be calculated. The *ordinary* production of foreign industry, in any particular branch, may be estimated *with some* accuracy; but the extraordinary fluctuation, to which their markets are liable from great political convulsions and from other causes, cannot with any. Every violent change there, invariably forces upon our markets their vast accumulations, which, easily breaking down the feeble barrier of a mere revenue protection, involves in ruin all who have essayed competition in the same branch. The consumer may be benefitted for the moment, but a re-action certainly follows—great fluctuations engender a spirit of speculation; and mere gambling is substituted for all regular traffic. The frequent recurrence of these evils, (every where acknowledged to be such), is only to be prevented by a system of protection, which, when efficient for the main purpose, is, as has been proved, abundantly so for this also.

Having, as they believe, satisfactorily shewn the beneficial effects of a system of *real* protection to the consumer of iron, your committee will proceed with a few brief remarks upon its influence on the agriculture, labour and internal trade of the country.

From a critical examination of the returns from 73 furnaces and 132 forges, in a great variety of situations, the details of which are more particularly stated in the paper annexed and marked E, they find, that in the manufacture of the iron, in its first stages only, made in the United States in the past year, agricultural produce to the amount of nearly three and an half millons of dollars has been consumed; which vast sum has been paid by the manufacturers, and those employed by them, to the farmer, shewing how completely his interest is identified with their's, and furnishing him with the means of estimating the probable consequences to himself of the destruction of this branch of industry, and the conversion of so large a body of consumers into cultivators and producers.

By the same statement it appears that nearly twenty-five thousand workmen are constantly employed, receiving annually the sum of seven millions four hundred and ninety three thousand and seven hundred dollars; making, with their families, nearly one hundred and twenty-five thousand persons directly dependent upon this manufacture.

For transporting this iron to the markets where it is sold to the consumer, it is calculated that about one million and a quarter of dollars are annually paid, being a further contribution to labour and agriculture.

These facts, your committee believe, sufficiently shew how completely interwoven are the interests of agriculture and labour. with those of manufactures. They think, and they hope hereafter to demonstrate it, that those of commerce are not less so; but, for the present, will refer to one fact frequently alleged and recently and triumphantly reiterated, in support of a different view of the subject—namely, that every ship of the burthen of 500 tons, is subjected to a tax, occasioned by the duties on the foreign articles entering into her construction, of two thousand dollars, of which that on iron forms a large proportion. Without wishing to detract in the slightest degree from the merits of a branch of our industry that has secured so much of glory to our national character, as well as profit to our country, it must not be forgotten that this interest, which was one of the earliest subjects of national regard, has, for a long period, enjoyed a protection in the discriminating tonnage duty of 94 cents per ton, which, on a vessel of 500 tons, amounts to 470 dollars on every voyage; and, admitting the supposition that she makes three voyages yearly, such protection amounts to 1410 dollars per annum. And inasmuch as it is understood to be a principle of mercantile calculation, that a new outfit is to occur every five years, there is a protection amounting to seven thousand and fifty dollars against the tax of 2000—and if it be true that the community suffers by protecting our domestic industry, it would seem not politic for those interested in navigation to appear as complainants. And this, it must be observed, is independent of the 10 per cent. discriminating duty on all merchandise imported in foreign bottoms, imposed solely to foster the shipping interests of the country.

It may be argued that this system of discriminating duties is disappearing before the reciprocities offered and embraced in many of our commercial treaties. But let it be remembered, that these reciprocities have been the fruit of a rigid adherence to the protecting system, to which even the "mistress of the ocean" has been compelled to succumb, affording a perfect illustration of the efficacy of those principles for which we contend; and which will eventually oblige the manufacturing nations of Europe and else-

where, either to extend the right hand of reciprocity to our agriculturalists, manufacturers and mechanics, as they have done to our merchants, or to sink before the unequal conflict with American ingenuity and American enterprise.

The committee deem it here proper to advert to the attempts which have, for some two years past, been made to array the interests of the manufacturers of iron, in its higher stages, to wit—hardware, &c. against its primary manufacturers, and the efforts which have accompanied these attempts to obtain a large reduction of the existing duties upon some descriptions of iron, and a total abolition of those upon others, for the alleged purpose of placing these two branches of industry upon an equal footing in the home market.

Fully to counteract such efforts, your committee believed it would only be requisite to ascertain what proportion of the value of the manufactured article consisted of the duty on the bar and sheet iron entering into its composition; and what, of that, upon the value given abroad by the subsequent elaboration. To determine this, they took a lock, *called a Scotch spring lock*, which weighed two pounds—they supposed that half a pound of iron was lost in making—total weight, $2\frac{1}{2}$, deduct half a pound of brass—weight of iron 2 pounds, which, at the *highest duty* of $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. is seven cents. The sterling cost of this lock, with charges subject to duty, was twenty three pence, and the duty, as calculated at the custom house, very nearly twelve cents.

In this case, if the American manufacturer of locks had imported his iron at the *highest* rate of duty, he would have paid a tax (if the duty be a tax) of seven cents, and would have received a protection of twelve cents, as against the foreign manufacturer of hardware.

Another lock called a closet lock, cost, with charges, two shillings and three pence; duty as above nearly 14 cents, and weighed, with the same allowance, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a pound—duty, at the highest rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents, is 2 5-8 cents. Here the manufacturer of hardware would receive *five times* more protection on the same article than the iron manufacturer.

A third lock, called a mortice lock, cost, with charges, five shillings—duty as above 30 cents, and weighed, with the same allowances and deductions for brass, 2 pounds—which, at the highest rate of duty as before, is 7 cents.

Here the protection to the hardware manufacturer, as compared with the iron maker, is nearly four and an half to one. In all these cases the *highest duty is taken on iron* and the *lowest on hardware.*

The inquiries of the committee having, so far, exhibited results so entirely at variance with statements which had been widely circulated under high authority, they became apprehensive that it would be alleged these examples had been purposely selected with reference to such result; and, although they were, in truth, taken entirely at random, yet they believed it to be their duty to pursue the investigation on a more extended scale, and, if possible, to embrace the entire importations of the country—a course, the perfect fairness of which, they think, cannot be called in question.

It was known to one of your committee, that, when the applications already referred to, were before congress, a highly respectable house of this city, engaged both in the manufacture of iron and importation of hardware, had taken up the memorials and statements upon which the subsequent report of the select committee of the senate was founded, and examined them in

detail. They were, accordingly, invited by the committee to assist them in the investigation—their aid was cheerfully and promptly furnished, and the result will be found in the document annexed and marked F.

To refer particularly to every part of this elaborate and most valuable paper, would occupy too much of the time of the convention, and would swell this report beyond all reasonable limits. Nor could justice be done it, by any reference, however particular. It is respectfully, but earnestly, recommended to the careful perusal of every member.

Your committee, however, solicit the attention of the convention to a few remarks upon some of the most striking errors of fact contained in the memorials, statements, and report already alluded to, which they deem too important to pass without such notice.

One great object of the memorialists was to obtain the importation of English iron at a very low rate of duty, on the alleged ground that it was superior to other iron for many, and equal for most purposes, for which iron is used.

In answer to this it is shewn that, although this iron can now be imported in every required form of bolts and bars, at full twenty per cent. less than other iron, yet, such is the character which experience has stamped upon it, that only *one seventh* of all the iron imported is of this kind, and, of the entire consumption, it forms but *one thirty-ninth part!* To admit the statement of the memorialists, in this respect to be true, would therefore be to suppose an ignorance of their profession and interests, on the part of the American blacksmiths and others, workers in iron, which your committee cannot for a moment sanction.

The memorialists stated that the duty on iron was from 159 to 282 per cent. or from 6 to 11 times the duty on hardware. The want of candour manifested by the *general character* of this statement, is fully exposed in the examination, where it is shewn that the quantity paying the duty of 37 dollars per ton, is but one seventh, and that paying 78 40-100 but one thirtieth of the whole importation, and but 1-39th and 1-112th parts of the entire consumption.

Your committee have already had occasion to advert to the extraordinary error committed by the memorialists, when they fixed the manufacture of iron in this country at 35,000 tons. They now beg to call the attention of the convention to an error as remarkable on the other hand.

For the apparent purpose of exhibiting, in mortifying contrast, the insignificance of the domestic manufacture, when compared with the foreign importations, the entire consumption is assumed at 116,844 tons.

Leaving, after the deduction of the above - - - 35,000

To be supplied from abroad the quantity of - - 81,844 tons.

Of this last quantity it is stated that 47,798 tons *were imported in the form of hardware, at a duty varying from* 5.50 *to* 8.25 *per ton*, and that, in this way, this large quantity of iron was introduced at an aggregate duty of - - - - - - - 284,293 17-100

"while the same weight of iron imported in its raw state "of bar, sheet, rod, or hoop iron, estimating the duty at "only 37 dollars per ton, and leaving out of considera- "tion the duty of 3½ cents, would have paid" - 1,568,526

"At this rate," they say—"the discriminating duty in favour of the Bri-"tish manufacturer (of hardware) was actually 1,284,232 83-100 dollars, "for the fiscal year 1828-29."

The above *weights* it is admitted are obtained by *estimates*—that is, by assuming one third of the gross value of the hardware imported to be the cost of the raw material of iron, and then bringing that third into tons at 23 33-100 per ton. The experiments on a small scale, already recited in this report, shewed the error of these estimates:—When brought to a practical test, on a scale embracing every article in the whole range of importation, their true character was made even more manifest. The committee again refer to the examination of Messrs. Green and Wetmore, by which it will appear that the whole weight of the above hardware (including brass, horn, and all other materials) was but 9,763 tons, instead of 47,798 tons, and that the duty actually paid was rather more than *one hundred and four dollars per ton.* That if the American manufacturer of hardware had imported the iron and paid the duty mentioned by the memorialists of 37 dollars per ton, he would have paid the sum of - - $361,231

And would have been protected by a duty on the manufactured article of - - - - - - - - - 1,003,843

Making a discrimination, for the fiscal year 1828-9, in favour, not of the British manufacturer of hardware of one million two hundred and eighty four thousand two hundred and thirty-two dollars and eighty three cents—but in favour of the American manufacturer of hardware, over both the British hardware manufacturer and the American manufacturer of iron, of six hundred and forty-two thousand six hundred and twelve dollars.

Here your committee might, they believe, safely rest this part of the subject, deeming their duty in relation to it fully discharged. They will detain the convention only while they present a brief summary of the different, and, in some instances, opposite conclusions, to which a careful examination of the same subject has brought them, when compared with those put forth by the memorialists

They (the memorialists) say that the entire consumption of iron in the United States, is - - - - - - - - - 116,344 tons.

Your committee have shewn that, in domestic and imported bar iron, taking the imports (with the exception of hardware) as stated by the memoralists themselves, and in castings, it amounts to - - - - - - - - 158,280 tons.

If the estimates of the memorialists, as respects hardware, had been retained, the quantity would have been swelled to - - - - - - - - - - - 196,315

instead of 116,344, and it is with reference to that quantity that the comparison of statements should be made.

The memorialists say that of this quantity consumed but 35,000 are made in the United States.

Your committee have shewn that of bar iron there is produced 96,621 tons.

And of castings - - - - - - - - - 28,273

Together - 124,894

but if reduced to pig iron, the mode of computation always adopted in Great Britain, the quantity would rise to 163,542 tons, instead of 35,000.

Of the quantity made here, the memorialists say but 10,000 tons reach the seaboard.

Your committee, upon what they deem good authority, believe that one third of all the bar iron, and more than two thirds of all the castings, pass through the markets on the seaboard—they shall have occasion to notice this item more particularly hereafter. For the present, they will only remark, that *more than* 10,000 *tons are annually made in New Jersey alone, all manufactured within a few miles of the seaboard and nearly all sent to the markets there.*

The memorialists say that of *rolled* iron ten-elevenths are imported in the manufactured state, and the remaining eleventh in the raw state.

Your committee have shewn that the actual proportions are a little more than two to one instead of 11 to 1.

They say that the quantity of *rolled* iron, in all its various forms, compared with *hammered* iron, is nearly in the proportion of *two to one.*

Your committee shew that the true proportion is but a little more than *one to nine.*

They say that of 90,000 tons of iron sold in the markets of the seaboard, but one ninth, including *all* descriptions, is American.

Your committee have shewn that of about 95,000 tons sold in those markets, about 52,000 tons, or *four* ninths, are of American manufacture.

They say that the American iron, compared with foreign iron imported in the shape of hardware, is in the proportion of one to six, or, out of 60,000 tons but 10,000.

Your committee have shewn that the true proportions are as nearly as possible the reverse—namely, as six to one, or but 9,763 tons imported in hardware against 52,000 tons American brought to the seaboard.

The memorialists allege that 47,798 tons of iron, in the form of hardware, were imported in one year. Your committee have shewn that the real amount was 9,763 tons.

The memorialists assert that the duty on iron is from 6 to 11 times that on hardware. Your committee shew that the duty on hardware is 3 to 4 times that on the iron entering into its composition, even if that duty be estimated at 37 dollars per ton, which is 11 dollars per ton more than the average rate.

The memorialists assert that sheet iron, in the form of tea trays, can be be introduced at a cost of 83 72-100 per ton. Your committee shew that the true cost is 396 22-100 dollars.

They assert that but eleven thousand persons are employed in the United States in the manufacture of iron. Your committee have shewn that the number is nearly twenty-five thousand.

Finally, the memorialists complain of the oppressive burthen which the protection afforded to this inconsiderable quantity, as they call it, of American iron, has been to them in their business. To shew the extent of this burthen, they had previously asserted that the existing laws had operated, in a single year, in favour of the British manufacturer of hardware over the American, to the amount of one million two hundred and eighty four thousand, two hundred and thirty two dollars and eighty three cents.

Your committee have shewn that the actual discrimination in favour of—*not the British but the American* manufacturers of hardware, that is of all

of the petitioners themselves who are such, was, in that *same year*, at the lowest computation, very nearly six hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Your committee earnestly invite every practical American mechanic to examine this subject for himself—to look well into their statements, and ascertain to what extent his interests are guarded by existing laws; and having done so, they cannot doubt an unanimous opposition on the part of that respectable and valuable class of our citizens, to any such suggestions as those embraced in the concluding prayers of the memorialists which have been under examination.

Your committee feel that they ought to apologise for having occupied so much of the time of the convention in the examination of this memorial, which might be thought not strictly within the range of their duties. It would seem that errors of such magnitude must be self-evident, and could require no exposition. Your committee would willingly have adopted this opinion—but the importance that had been given to this document, by the course pursued in the senate of the United States, forced them to a different conclusion. In that venerable body it was referred to a select committee of its most distinguished members—a majority of whom, by adopting all its statements as facts, and its opinions and arguments as just, re-affirming them, indeed, after they had been questioned in counter memorials, have thereby changed their character, have lent to them the high authority of their names and station, and stamped them with an importance which they did not originally possess. They have been widely and industriously circulated under the imposing sanction of a report of the senate, and so much have they been relied on, that it has been triumphantly asserted they would "break the iron arch" which supports our system, and thus bring the whole fabric to the ground.

These were the considerations that governed your committee in the course they have pursued, and they hope to find in them a sufficient excuse for their trespass upon the time and attention of the convention. In the performance of this duty they have found it impossible to be brief—where so many assertions were to be met and refuted. this was out of the question. The same allegation met them again and again, in some new form, varied to suit the occasion—hence repetition was unavoidable. They trust their apology will be found in the necessity of their situation.

Before dismissing this subject, your committee owe it to justice and themselves to say, that they entirely acquit the distinguished gentlemen, composing the majority of the committee of the senate, of even a suspicion of any intention to mislead. They cheerfully concede to them the same sincerity and singleness of motive and purpose which your committee claim for themselves; while they regret, as they do most deeply, that they should have been made the instruments of so extensive a dissemination of error.

In the preceding examination your committee had occasion to notice and refute the statement, that but a small portion of American iron reached the markets on the coast. In a communication addressed to the convention recently assembled in a neighboring city, which derives importance from having been adopted by that respectable body as a part of its proceedings, it is, among other things asserted, that but 430,000 dollars in value of all the iron manufactured in this country, *including duty or bounty* reaches the seaboard. The presumed object of this assertion, as well as

those in which the quantity was stated at 10,000 tons, is to make it appear that the abolition of the duty on foreign iron would affect but a small number of the manufacturers of the domestic article; while it would relieve the mass of the consumers on the sea board from the *supposed* tax upon the foreign.

To shew the value of this assertion your committee beg leave to refer again to statement A, where it will be seen that, in a small district of West Jersey, alone—iron amounting to more than half a million of dollars, is annually made, the *whole* of which finds a market in the neighboring sea ports.

Your committee were instructed to report upon cutlery, and the manufactures of iron in its higher stages.

They have found it impossible, in the limited time allowed them, to do more than ascertain that they are numerous and of great extent and value. They annex two statements marked G and H—the one exhibiting the annual amount of manufactures in a single county of Connecticut, the value of which is nearly nineteen hundred thousand dollars—iron constituting one-fourth, and those of that material in its higher branches nearly one-tenth. The second shews the value of manufactures for one year in the small county of Delaware, in Pennsylvania, amounting to nearly fourteen hundred thousand dollars, of which those of iron form more than one-seventh. These two instances, taken at random, may serve to convey some idea of the vast amount and value of the manufacturing interest of the entire country.

The committee have deemed the article of steel of sufficient importance to merit a distinct report which will be found annexed, marked I, and is respectfully recommended to the particular attention of all those who take an interest in that valuable branch of our industry.

The last consideration that occurs to your committee as properly within their duty to notice, is the capability of the United States to furnish a supply of iron equal to their own wants. Of this the committee cannot entertain the smallest doubt. The tabular statements heretofore referred to, shew that, in two years, from 1828 to 1830, the supply has increased very nearly twenty-five per cent. and it is known that old establishments, in many situations, are enlarging, and new ones erecting, giving assurance that this increase will be progressive, until not only the domestic market will be fully supplied, but a surplus remain for exportation, creating thereby a new source to meet the demands of foreign commerce and additional means of employment for our navigation.

If we compare our situation with that of Great Britain, in this particular, less than a century ago, we shall see abundant reason for self-gratulation. Ninety years since, her entire production of iron did not much exceed that which is now made in the state of New Jersey. In 1802, within the limits of a single generation, her furnaces were less in number than those now existing in the United States, and their production not more than will be made here during the present year—and this without availing ourselves of the means to which she is indebted for the extraordinary change which this comparatively short period has effected. We have the benefit of her experience—we can command her skill, if it be necessary—we have the mineral fuels, which have done so much for her, in unlimited abundance, when our forests fail—our citizens yield to none in enterprise and inge-

nuity, when adequate rewards for the exercise of those qualities are held out—and knowing this, with the experience of our rapid progress in the last two years, furnishing, as we now do, more than three-fourths of the entire consumption, is it, we repeat, extravagant to assert, that we are fully competent to supply our own wants, and furnish a surplus to minister to those of our neighbors?

In conclusion, your committee cannot refrain from the expression of the gratification which the result of this investigation has afforded them. Deserted by the government, and denied that protection, which, at the close of the late war, was freely granted to almost every other interest, this important branch of domestic industry, so essential to the prosperity, if not to the existence of all others, and so closely allied to real national independence, seemed threatened with absolute extinction. A wiser policy, adopted at a later period, aided by the unconquerable spirit of American enterprise, has raised it from comparative insignificance to the elevated rank which it now holds; and to maintain it in which, it asks, as it believes, no sacrifice from its fellow citizens, engaged in other pursuits. Grateful for the consideration which its well founded claims upon their justice, after years of delay and suffering, at last obtained, it is now returning to them the full measure of benefit which it has received at their hands, and will continue to protect them, as heretofore, from speculation and monopoly from abroad, should it not a second time become the victim of that unnatural policy, which cherishes foreign while it neglects and destroys our native industry.

By order of the committee,

B. B. HOWELL, *secretary.*

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT.

Before separating, the committee instructed the secretary to make a further report of any facts that might be received in time, for the permanent committee. In conformity therewith he has now to state, that Mr. Peter Townsend, who was delegated by those engaged in the manufacture of iron in this city, to visit all the establishments in this state and those east of it, has returned, and reported the result of his examination—by which it appears, that in New York there are in operation, of blast furnaces not included in the estimates of the above reports 8

In Connecticut 3

And information, from various other places, enumerates furnaces not before known, to the number of 26

In the whole 37 additional furnaces, making of pig iron and castings 25,250 tons, and a large number of forges employed in converting the pig into bar iron.

There are returns also of 32 bloomery fires in situations where it was not before known that any existed, making 30 tons each per annum, or nearly 1,000 tons yearly of bar iron, by this process—and the returns brought by Mr. Townsend shew that the committee estimated this kind of iron nearly 1,000 tons too low in the districts which he visited.

The result of the whole would be, if 20,000 tons of the above pig iron be converted into bars

Bar iron,		14,285
Bloomed bar iron as above,		1,960
Bar iron, per former statements,		96,621
Total of bar iron made in the United States, agreeably to the information received by the committee to this date,		112,866
Stated in pig iron, it would be—		
Former statement,	163,542	tons.
Pig iron and castings as above,	25,250	
Bloomed bar iron equal to,	2,744	
Total of iron equal to pig iron,	191,536	tons.

The value of which, according to the mode of estimation already explained, would be thirteen millions three hundred and twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and sixty dollars.

It is hardly necessary to add that these additional facts strengthen all the inferences and calculations heretofore made by the committee.

B. B. HOWELL, *secretary.*

NEW YORK, *November* 1831.

Appendix to the Report on Iron and Steel.

STATEMENT A.

The committee of manufactures of iron appointed by the convention assembled at Philadelphia, to examine the returns received in answer to the circulars addressed to different individuals engaged in that branch of industry; report the following tabular statement, as the result of their investigations:

STATES.	1828.			1829.			1830.		
	No. of furnaces.	Tons of pig iron.	Tons of castings.	No. of furnaces.	Tons of pig iron.	Tons of castings.	No. of furnaces.	Tons of pig iron.	Tons of castings.
Pennsylvania,	44	24,822	3,693	44	27,425	4,564	45	31,056	5,506
New Jersey,	11	1,733	6,264	11	1,941	5,998	10	1,671	5,615
Maryland,	5	2,247	483	5	1,715	1,065	6	3,163	1,259
Virginia,	2	400	50	2	702	72	2	538	43
Ohio,							7	5,400	250
Delaware,	1	450	350	1	450	350	1	450	350
Missouri,							2	590	250
	63	29,652	10,840	63	32,233	12,049	73	42,868	13,273

One furnace erected in Pennsylvania in 1830, will, in 1831, make 1,100 tons of pig iron.

In addition to the seventy-three furnaces mentioned in the preceding table, from which detailed returns had been received, the committee had information of one hundred and twenty-nine furnaces, in the states of Pennsylvania, New York, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Tennessee, New Hampshire, Virginia and Ohio, in actual operation; but from them had then received no returns. Taking the production of the seventy-three furnaces, from which returns have been received, as the rule for estimating the whole, and the following would be the result:

YEARS.	Furnaces.	Tons of pig iron.	Tons of castings.	Total of pig iron and castings.
1828	192	90,368	33,036	123,404
1829	192	98,234	36,720	134,954
1830	202	118,620	36,728	155,348

But as the greater part of the furnaces not included in the returns, are situated in districts where but few castings are made, the committee have not felt authorised to estimate the quantity of castings made at them at more than about 5 per cent. of their entire production, which would give the following proportions and results:

YEARS.	Furnaces.	Tons of pig iron.	Tons of castings.	Total of pig iron and castings.
1828	192	108,564	14,840	123,404
1829	192	118,405	16,549	134,954
1830	202	137,075	18,273	155,348

From the best information the committee have been able to collect on this subject, they estimate that of the pig iron made in these years, about ten thousand tons

per annum, have, upon an average, been converted in the air furnaces and cupolas into castings, leaving to be manufactured into bar iron.

In 1828, of pig iron 98,564 tons, making of bars 70,403 tons.
1829, " 108,405 " " 77,432 "
1830, " 127,075 " " 90,768 "

And which quantities severally correspond with remarkable proportional accuracy with the returns from 132 forges, which accompanied the returns from the 73 furnaces first mentioned.

In East Jersey—in a part of Connecticut—in a large district of New York, and in Vermont, bar iron is extensively made by the process technically denominated *blooming*—or by a single operation from the ore, without the intervention of the blast furnace.

The returns already received justify the committee in putting down this description of bar iron for the

Year 1828 at 5,341 tons,
1829 at 5,654 "
1830 at 5,853 "
} Of which 2,197 tons in East Jersey.

Making a total of bar iron

For 1828 of 75,744 tons,
1829 of 83,086
1830 of 96,621

And the entire quantity of iron in its first stage, as shewn in the following table:

DESCRIPTION OF IRON.	1828. Tons	1829. Tons.	1830. Tons.
Pig iron,	108,564	118,405	137,075
Castings from blast furnaces,	14,840	16,549	18,273
Bloomed bar iron, for the years respectively, reduced to pig iron, at 28 cwt. to the ton of bars.	7,477	7,916	8,194
Total iron in pigs and castings.	130,881	142,870	163,542

Total increase of all kinds of iron in two years, very nearly, 25 per cent.

For the purpose of determining the value of the above iron, the committee have taken the average prices of the principal sea ports, and those of Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, and have estimated that two-thirds of the bar iron made in the United States, is sold in the western markets—the proportion may be greater, which would increase the entire value.

In 1828, the average price of American hammered iron, in the principal cities east of the Susquehannah, was 105 dollars, and at Pittsburgh and Cincinnati 125 dollars, the average, estimated as above, would be 118⅓. In 1829 the prices were 100 and 122, giving an average of 114⅔, and in 1830, 90 and 100 dollars, average 96⅔. Castings, from the blast furnaces, are valued at 60 dollars, although many sell higher, and from the air furnace and cupola, at 4½ cts per lb.—which is certainly not above the average rate.

At these prices, the aggregate value of the iron made

In 1828 would be 10,861,440 dollars,
1829 " 11,528,134 "
1830 " 11,444,410 "

Increase in market value in two years less than 5½ per cent.—decrease in value from 1829 to 1830, nearly three-fourths of one per cent.

STATEMENT B.

Prices of iron in England, taken from the invoices of the importers in New York.

Years.	Flat.	Rounds.					Square.		
	Common size.	Common size.	5-8	1-2	3-8	1-4	Com.	1-2	
1806	*l.*20 6 0	22 6 0	23 6 0	27 0 0			19 6 0		
1808		14 5 0	15 5 0						
1809	14 0 0	15 0 0	16 0 0				14 0 0	17 0 0	
1810	13 0 0	14 0 0		17 0 0			13 0 0	16 0 0	
1815	11 0 0	11 0 0	11 0 0	16 0 0			11 0 0	13 0 0	
1816	10 0 0	10 0 0	10 0 0				10 0 0	12 0 0	
1819	12 6 0	12 6 0	12 6 0				12 6 0		
1820	9 16 9	10 0 0	10 6 0	11 6 0	12 5			11 6 0	
1821	8 15 6	8 15 6	8 15 6	9 5 6	11 14	13 13	8 15 6	9 15 6	
1822	8 0 0	8 0 0	8 0 0	10 3 0			8 0 0		
1823	8 4 0	8 4 6	8 4 6	9 4 6			8 4 0	9 4 0	11 4 0
1824	9 2 0	9 2 0	9 2 0		11 6		9 2 0		
1825	13 15 0	13 15 0	14 6 0				14 6 0	15 6 0	
1826	10 6 0	10 6 0	11 6 0	12 3 0	14 3		10 6 0		
1827	9 13 0	9 13 0	10 0 0		11 7	13 7	9 13 0	10 7 0	11 7 0
Feb'ry 1828	8 9 0	8 9 0	8 9 0			13 0	8 9 0	9 10 0	11 0 0
July 1828	7 9 0	7 9 0	7 9 0				7 9 0		10 5 0
1829	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0				6 0 0		
1830	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	7 0 0	9 0	11 0	6 0 0		
1831	5 10 0 to 6*l.*	same	same	6 10 0 to 7*l*	9 0	11 0	5 10 to 6*l.*		

The above prices are pounds, shillings and pence, sterling, per ton.

In 1806, the difference between common sizes and half inch, was nearly 7*l.* sterling per ton. It required twenty-five years to bring it down to the present difference of about 1 pound.

B. B. Howell, esq.

SIR--I have the honor to hand you the following prices of iron in Sweden, from 1815 to 1831—and you may consider the Russian new sable was at the same prices, and P. S. I. at 20*s.* sterling, per ton, higher, at the same periods.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) N. SALTUS.

		£ *st.*						£ *st.*		
March	1815	12	0	0	September	1824	10	7	6	
July	1816	13	10	0	December	1824	11	5	0	
October	1816	12	10	0	April	1825	14	3	0	
March	1817	13	10	0	September	1825	14	19	0	
June	1817	14	0	0	June	1826	12	0	0	
February	1819	16	10	0	July	1827	12	9	0	
December	1819	13	3	0	October	1827	13	5	0	
January	1820	14	10	0	December	1827	13	5	0	
June	1821	13	5	0	September	1828	13	15	0	
September	1821	11	14	0	May	1829	13	15	0	
November	1822	11	10	0	June	1829	13	9	0	
April	1823	12	4	0	September	1829	12	19	0	
August	1823	11	10	0	December	1829	12	0	0	
December	1823	11	0	0	April	1830	11	0	0	
March	1824	11	5	0	May	1831	10	10	0	
August	1824	10	11	0						

Wholesale prices of hammered bar iron in the sea-ports of the United States.

1793	90 to 95 *dolls. per ton.*	1813	115 to 125 *dolls. per ton.*
1794	,, ,,	1814	125 to 145
1795	,, ,,	1815	130 to 150
1796	,, ,,	1816	110 to 120
1797	100 to 105	1817	90 to 100
1798	,, ,,	1818	,, ,,
1799	95 to 100 .	1819	,, ,,
1800	,, ,,	1820	,, ,,
1801	110 to 120	1821	85 to 95
1802	105 to 110	1822	,, ,,
1803	,, ,,	1823	90
1804	,, ,,	1824	,,
1805	,, ,,	1825	105
1806	,, ,,	1826	105
1807	110 to 115	1827	100
1808	,, ,,	1828	105
1809	,, ,,	1829	100
1810	115 to 120	1830	90
1811	110 to 115	1831	75 to 85
1812	,, ,,		

STATEMENT C.

Shewing the effects of a tariff of protection on the article of iron at Pittsburgh and Cincinnati:—

In the years 1818, '19 and '20, bar iron in Pittsburgh sold at from 190 to 200 dollars per ton. Now the price is 100 dollars per ton.

In the same years, boiler iron was 350 dollars per ton. Now at 140 dollars per ton.

Sheet iron was but little made in those years, and sold for 18 dollars per cwt. Now made in abundance and sold at 8½ dollars per cwt.

Hoop iron, under same circumstances, was then 250 dollars, and is now 120 dolls.

Axes were then 24 dollars per doz. and are now 12 dollars.

Scythes are now 50 per cent. lower than they were then—as are spades and shovels.

Iron hoes were in those years 9 dollars per doz. Now a very superior article of *steel* hoes at 4 to 4½ dollars.

Socket shovels are made at 4½ dollars by the same individual who, a few years ago, sold them at 12 dollars per doz.

Slater's patent stoves, imported from England, sold in Pittsburgh at 350 to 400 dollars—A much superior article is now made there and sold for 125 to 150 dollars.

English vices then sold for 20 to 22½ cents per lb. now a superior article is sold at 10 to 10½.

Brazier's rods in 1824 were imported, and cost 14 cents per lb. or $313 60 per ton. Now supplied to any amount of ¼ to 3-8 diameter, at $130 per ton.

Steam engines have fallen in price since 1823, one-half, and they have one-half more work on them.

The engine at the Union Rolling mill, (Pittsburgh), in 1819, cost $11,000—a much superior one of 130 horse power, for Sligo mill, cost, in 1826, 3,000 dollars.

In 1830, there were made in Pittsburgh one hundred steam engines.

In 1831, one hundred and fifty will be made, averaging 2,000 dollars; or 300,00 in that article alone.

A two horse power engine costs 250 dollars; six horse 500 dollars; eight to nine horse 700 dollars. The cost are the prices delivered and put up.

At least 600 tons of iron made in Pittsburgh are manufactured into other articles before it leaves the city, from steam engines, of the largest size, down to a three-penny nail.

Eight rolling and slitting mills of the largest power, are in the city of Pittsburgh—five of which have been erected since 1828.

Thirty-eight new furnaces have been erected since 1824 in the western parts of Pennsylvania, and that part of Kentucky bordering on the Ohio river, most of them since 1828.

The quantity of iron rolled at Pittsburgh was in

1828	tons	3,291 19 0 0
1829	"	6,217 17 0 0
1830	"	9,282 2 0 0

Being an increase of nearly 200 per cent. in two years.

The above facts were furnished by members of the committee residing at Pittsburgh, who vouch for their accuracy.

One fact there stated, suggests the following remarks to the committee:

To the report of the select committee of the senate of the United States, on the subject of iron, is appended, among other papers, one in which it is stated, that "it "is now ascertained that the superiority of England over France is entirely due to "the cheapness of iron: a six horse steam engine, for instance, in France, costs on "the average, at least 500 *dollars more than in England*, owing to the cheapness of iron "in Great Britain—*It is still dearer in the United States than in France.*"

Here it is asserted that a six horse power steam engine costs 500 dollars more in France than it does in England, and that it is still dearer in the United States than in France. Now it so happens, that in the United States, at Pittsburgh, a steam engine, of that power, can be put up, ready for action, for the identical sum of 500 dollars.

Prices of Iron at Cincinnati.

1814 to 1818, bar iron 200 to 220 dollars per ton—now 100, 105, 110. The fall in prices has been nearly as follows:

1826	bar iron assorted	125	to	135	dollars.
1827	"	120	to	130	"
1828	"	115	to	125	"
1829	"	112½	to	122½	"
1830	"	100	to	110	"
1831	"	100	to	110	"

Castings, including hollow ware, 1814 to 1818, 120 to 130 dollars per ton: present price 60 to 65, and the quality much improved.

Statement D.

The duties on iron imported into the United States, were, 1804 to 1812, 15 per cent.—double war duties from 1812 to 1816. In 1816, duties, rolled iron 30 dollars per ton, hammered 9 dollars. The law of 1816, fixing the duties at these rates, ruined many of the manufacturers and compelled them to abandon their works. By the act of April 20, 1818, the duty on hammered iron was raised to 15 dollars. This, in some measure, revived the manufacture, and many, who had abandoned, resumed their operations. The foreign manufacturer, to keep possession of the market, offered his iron at a less price; so that there was an actual decline here. In 1824 the duty on hammered iron was raised to 18 dollars, and in 1828 to $22 40. These additions to the duty had no permanent effect in raising the price. The foreign manufacturer could not advance his prices beyond those of 1824, because the American iron maker supplied the market at those rates; and iron, at a duty of $22 40, sells at less than it did at one of 9 dollars. The foreign manufacturer has been compelled to take the additional duties from his profits—and these deductions from his profits have been paid into the treasury of the United States, without adding to the price paid by the American consumer.

The following table shews the operation of the additional duty levied since 1818 on hammered iron alone.

		Tons.	*Duties.*
1818	imported of hammered iron	13,931	208,950 dollars.
1819	,, ,,	16,160	242,394
1820	,, ,,	19,531	272,877
1821	,, ,,	15,374	230,413
1822	,, ,,	26,373	378,641
1823	,, ,,	29,014	435,210
1824	,, ,,	21,298	383,364
1825	,, ,,	23,085	428,490
1826	,, ,,	23,837	427,066
1827	,, ,,	21,718	390,924
1828	,, ,,	33,155	663,100
1829	,, ,,	29,202	654,141
1830	,, ,, estimated*	29,202	654,141
	Tons	301,880 =	5,369,711 dollars.
Duties at $9, the rate per law of 1816,			2,716,920
Gain in the treasury, at the expense of the foreign manufacturer			$2,652,791

STATEMENT E.

The following calculations were made by Hardman Phillips and George Valentine, esqrs. and are derived from the average returns submitted to the committee from two counties, (those most extensively engaged in the manufacture of iron in Pennsylvania), namely, Centre and Huntingdon, and have been carefully verified by a comparison with returns from 73 furnaces and 132 forges.

For each ton of bar iron and castings, made, the following agricultural produce is found to be consumed:

20 bushels wheat and rye, average at	75 *cts.*	$15 00
57 lbs. pork	5 ,,	2 85
43 ,, beef	4 ,,	1 72
10 ,, butter	12½ ,,	1 25
2 bushels potatoes	30 ,,	60
½ ton hay	7 ,,	3 50
For every ten tons of bar iron one horse is employed one whole year, worth $100—and experience shews that the mortality among horses so employed is per annum one in seven, and constitutes a charge of, per ton of		1 43
For fruit and vegetables, of which no return has been made, we feel justified in putting down		1 00
		$27 35

Which multiplied by the quantity of bar iron and castings, will give the sum of 3,415,850 dollars, paid by the iron manufacturers and those employed by them, to the farmers.

The same returns enable them to state, that every five tons of iron, as above made, requires one able bodied man throughout the year, or, in the whole, 24,979; and, as it appears that, upon an average, each one of these has four dependent upon him, it follows that 124,895 persons are supported by this branch of industry, in its first stages; and the average of the wages of the workmen being fully one dollar per day, or say 300 per annum, they receive for wages, in the whole, the large sum of 7,493,700 dollars, for the labor of one year.

The expense of transporting this iron to the different markets, by land and water, may be estimated at an average of $10 per ton—amounting to 1,248,940 dollars; the whole of which is distributed among those engaged in the transportation and coasting trade of the country, and sub-divided among those who furnish subsistence to the many persons employed, and in furnishing means for this branch of the business.

[*Since ascertained 30,973 tons—of which only 439 tons were *British*. The small amount of the latter importation, is the best possible evidence of the *bad quality* of English iron, as stated in subsequent pages, and of its unfitness for the usual purposes to which hammered iron is applied. All such iron pays the same duty.

Permanent Committee.]

STATEMENT F.

New York, 29th October, 1831.

To the committee on iron and steel, appointed by the convention of the friends of domestic industry, now in session in this city—

The following examination of the memorial of the workers of iron, and otbers, in Philadelphia, presented to congress in January, 1831, we submit to you for tbe use of the convention.

1st. Under their first head the memorialists embrace two subjects: first, the high duty on English iron, and secondly, its quality.

With respect to the rate of duty, we will answer when we review what is said on the same subject, under their 6th head.

With respect to its quality, the memorialists contradict tbe report of the committee of the senate,* which pronounced it "bad"—and say that "English iron is prefered for various purposes, on account of the decided superiority it possesses in various qualities—for its strength of cohesion, its excellence in welding, surpassing every other iron as in chains and anchors, in rails for railways, spikes and bolts; on account of the superior manner in which it is prepared in all the various forms required, as well as from its acknowledged superiority in durability; and for wheel tires for the same properties, as well as from the greater evenness with which it is always drawn,—and concludes by saying, that the American, Swedisb, Russian and English iron all sell in the Philadelphia market at about $100 per ton.

In answer to the above we would remark, that the small quantity of English iron imported, in comparison with tbe total imports of iron, itself confutes their statement as to its superior quality; and conclusively shows that the properties *it* possesses are not in *great* requisition here. The ratio of English iron imported, being less than 1 to 7, notwithstanding the advantage it has over otber foreign iron of being procured of any size, and at a cost of 20 per cent. less.

The little use to wbich this iron is put will appear more manifest, when compared with the total quantity consumed—as will be seen by refering to our statement under our 6th bead; being only 1-39 of the total consumption; and this too with its advantages as to size and price, above mentioned. These facts sbow incontestably in what repute this iron is held by consumers. We have been importers, and wholesale and retail dealers in the article, for many years, and our experience is,—that the united testimony of all consumers is in direct variance to the statement of tbe memorialists, as to its good quality: the low price and the convenient size in which it may he obtained, is, as a general remark, the only reason why it is sold at all.

The memorialists particularize for what purposes this iron is decidedly superior: first, as for *chains* and *anchors* on account of its strength of cobesion and excellence in welding. If it has more strength of cohesion than other iron, it is new to us, as well as to all the workers of iron, that we have enquired of on the subject. We have no facts before us of the strength of Englisb iron; but we have a certificate from commodore Hull, commandant of the navy yard at Washington, giving the strength of chain iron lately supplied by the New Jersey Iron company. Tbe 1¼ inch round, broke with 60 tons weight on it, the 1 1-8 inch round, broke with 41 tons weight on it.† If the memorialists have any trials to show tbat Englisb iron has more strength of cohesion than this, they are right; but we have no idea that the English iron sent to this country will bear any comparison with the above. As to its superiority in welding, we have enquired of several blacksmiths as to the facts—and they universally say, that American iron is better for welding. As to its being used for anchors in this country, we have made enquiries, and cannot ascertain tbat any is used for tbat purpose in the anchors that come to New York. It appears very strange that American iron for anchors should be sold at $115 per ton, and prefered at that price, while English iron can he bought at $72—if the English is superior.

With respect to its being superior for railways—we cannot conceive how the fact could be ascertained, as an experiment, we think, could not have been made, in this early stage of railways in this country. But as to its superiority for spikes and bolts, we positively deny it. Being sellers of both English and America iron, we know

*This refers to a report of a committee of the senate made at the previous session adverse to the memoriallsts.

†The proof required hy government for 1¼ inch round iron is 35 tons; for 1 1-8 inch round iron 16 tons.

[I find that at a trial at a chain cable factory in England, the best 1¼ inch ron broke at 43 tons. B. B. H.]

that the American iron is always prefered, as to the its quality. The English is only used in small vessels of 70 tons and under; while in larger vessels the American iron, at 20 per cent. higher price, is universally prefered.

As to the "superior manner in which it is prepared in all the various forms required, we would reply—that the rolling mills in this country make all the sizes required quite as handsome, and far better in quality, than the English.

Lastly, with respect to its "superiority for wheel tires,"—the experience and information of the memorialists is in direct opposition to ours; nor can we conceive how persons would continue, for years, to purchase Swedish and American iron for that purpose as they do, at 25 per cent. higher price—if the English was superior. It is, without question, the poorest iron for that use that can be purchased, and is only used on account of its low price; which, instead of being $5 per cwt. we sell by the single ton at 25 per cent. less, viz: $3 75 per cwt.

2nd. The second head of the memorial speaks of the manner of making iron in England, which requires no answer.

3rd. Under this head the memorialists speak of the hardships of purchasing imported iron, of small size, at a high price—in consequence of the duty being 3½ cents per lb. on it. That difficulty is now in some measure removed, as one factory in New Jersey is prepared to supply the United States with a better article, and at less price, than it can be imported; and the rolling mills now erecting in different parts of the United States, will be able, from next spring, to furnish all the iron that pays a duty of 3½ cents per lb. at less price, and better quality, than it can be imported for.

The following statement will show the comparative price of common bar iron and ½ inch round in England, from 1806 to 1830.

Common bar iron, cost		½ inch round, cost	
1806	£20 10 0	1806	£27 0 0
1809	14 0 0	1809	18 0 0
1815	11 0 0	1815	16 0 0
1822	8 0 0	1822	10 5
1830	6 0 0	1830	7 10 0

From the above it appears that the cost in England, as late as 1808, of common bar iron was *l* 20 10—and at the same time the price of ½ inch round was *l*. 27, or *l*.6 10 higher, which is a greater difference than is now made by our rolling mills; and we do not doubt but that the difference in price between bar iron and small round, made by our mills, will be reduced as the quantity made is increased, and our factories become more perfect, as has been the case in England. From 1806 to the present time, the price of iron in England has been gradually reduced in proportion to the increase of the rolling mills, perfection of machinery and skill of workmen. The present difference between bar iron and ½ inch round is but *l*1 per ton.

The quantity made in England in	1787	was	80,000 tons.
	1796	,,	130,000 ,,
	1830	,, nearly	700,000 ,,

4th. Requires no answer.

5th, 6th, 7th. Under these heads, the memorialists state that the present rate of duties on the raw material being so much higher than on the manufactured article, gives a decided monopoly to the manufacturers of hardware at Sheffield and Birmingham, that many articles can be imported at or under the present cost of bar iron—that they "have no other object in the relief they now pray for, than to enable them to bring their own industry into fair and equal competition with the foreign manufacturer." Here rests, the whole ground of complaint of the memorialists, viz: on the inequality between the duty on what they call the raw material and on the manufactured article. In order to substantiate the above they instance a number of articles of hardware, which they endeavor to show can be imported cheaper than the raw material itself We will first examine their statements of the articles particularized, and endeavor to show that they do not prove the point they wish to establish, and then show the true proportion between the duties on hardware and on the raw material; and we think it will be made to appear, that the manufacturers of hardware, in this country, instead of being less, are protected to a much greater extent than those of iron—which, if proved, will show that the whole ground of their complaint is without foundation. The first articles they instance are hammers and sledges for blacksmiths, which they say "are imported at $4 66 per cwt. which is 33½ cents below the cost of the bar iron in this market, exclusive of duty." We have imported hammers and sledges regularly for many years. The

poorest article we ever heard of being sent to our market, cost 7½ cents per lb.—those we import are of a quality fit for use, and cost 8¼ cents per lb. which is $9 25 per cwt., while we sell English bar iron at retail, for $3 75—leaving a difference of $5 50 per cwt. in favor of the manufacturer of these articles in this country. The next article they instance is wheel tire, which they say can be imported at less cost than bar iron. We have never known of its interfering with the sale of iron for that purpose. There has, indeed, been two lots of it imported into New York—but the house who had it, found a difficulty in selling it, and told us, to-day, that they would have no more.

The next article they advance is frying pans, and state that they are, and ever have been imported, at a less price than the cost of sheet iron, meaning to draw a comparison between the cost of iron in sheets and in its manufactured state. This comparison is evidently unfair, and calculated to deceive. Frying pans are not made of sheet iron only, but partly of sheet iron and partly of bar iron. We import the sheet iron part of frying pans, viz: the bowls, separate from the handles, and they cost, by an invoice dated January, 1831, 10 cents per lb. to import, while the sheet iron, in sheets, costs only 6 cents per lb. leaving a difference of 4 cents per lb. in favor of the sheet iron in a manufactured state. Frying pans, at the same time, cost 6 cents per lb. The next article presented by them is tea trays.—They state that tea trays, with one coat of japan, can be imported at $83 72 per ton, while the iron required for the same purpose is selling at from 160 to 170 dollars per ton. We have imported tea trays for many years, and are totally unable to devise how this can be done. The largest tray ever imported, or, if imported would be used, is 30 by 22 inches; and the poorest article that we ever saw cost 52 cents each tray to import, and weighed 4 lbs. which is 13 cts. per lb. or $290 per ton, instead of $83 72, as stated by the memorialists. If tea trays were imported to cut up for stove doors, blowers, &c as stated in the memorial, the edges, which are turned up, must be cut off, or flattened to a plain surface. And unless the memorialists should be more successful than ourselves in an experiment made to ascertain whether it could be flattened out, as it was before it was made into a tray, that business would not amount to much. The smith into whose hands we put it, gave it its proper heat, and endeavored to flatten it under his hammer—but the edges burst and the iron cracked at the angles where it had been bent to form a rim; so we were convinced that the edges, or rims, must be cut off, which we had done for the sake of experiment, the weight of which was 1½ lbs.—which, being only scrap iron, is not worth more than $25 per ton, and this loss, added to the cost of the tray, would bring the iron imported in the shape of trays, suitable for other purposes, as follows—

One ton of trays as above, cost	$291 00
Loss in rims cut off, 37 per cent.	109 00
Labor in cutting, one cent per tray	5 60
	405 60
Deduct 7½ cwt. scrap iron worth $25 per ton	9 38
Making the cost of sheet iron imported by this process, per ton,	$396 22

The cost of importing sheet iron of the thickness of tea trays is $135 per ton, instead of $160 to 170—as stated in the memorial. We do not say that what the memorialists state is untrue—but we do know the above statement to be correct, and cannot conceive how it could be reduced to $83 72 per ton, when we make them to cost $396 per ton.

The memorialists next show that iron knitting needles can be imported, cheaper than wire No. 18. This is true, because there is so little labor in cutting wire into knitting needles. The amount of this article sold per annum, we think, may amount to $200—*two hundred dollars*.

The memorialists next proceed to show that the duty on wrought nails precludes all possibility of competition between the domestic and foreign manufacturer. The fact about the nail making is, that the manufacture of nails (whether cut or wrought, it matters not) has been brought to such perfection in this country, that 40,000 tons are annually made here, while only 266 tons are imported.

The memorialists further state, that the duty on wire being high, operates against the manufacture of wire seives and fenders. We think they are unhappy in their selection of these articles also, to prove their point—as from all the information we

are able to collect, there are no wire seives nor fenders imported into New York—but that market is supplied exclusively by the domestic labor.

The next article they bring forward is horse shoes—which they say can be imported at the price of bar iron, and have become an article of import. This might have been said for many years past, as attempts have been made, from time to time, to import them to advantage—but all experiments, within our knowledge, have failed. We ourselves made the attempt about three years since—but could not do it to a profit; and are perfectly willing that others should purchase experience at the same cost. *Common English iron* would not answer for horse shoes. We have imported *best* English iron in bars for that purpose—but never could get any good enough. The American and Swedish are exclusively used.

The last article they instance is hoops for coopers, bent and rivetted, ready for use—which, they say, can be imported cheaper than the hoop iron. This *may* be true, for aught we know; but we have never heard of any having been imported, yet are in the practice of importing and selling hoop iron; and if there had been any competition from that quarter, we think we should have known it. For our part, we do not feel disposed to enter into the import of finished hoops, and it appears that others in the trade have a similar indisposition. We leave the reader to judge whether on the few articles they have *selected* to show that the manufactured article can be imported cheaper than the raw material, they have proved the point, which, if they have proved, would establish the principle as to a few articles only, and not on hardware in general.

We now proceed to show the true relative proportion between the duties on hardware and on the raw material. The memorialists say that "the duty on iron is from 159 to 282 per cent. or from 6 to 11 times the duty on hardware." When they say the duty on iron is from 159 to 282 per cent. they speak in such general terms as to convey the idea that the duty on iron, generally, is that much. We will first show what is the average duty on imported iron.

The quantity of iron annually imported, as stated by the memorialists, is as follows:

	Tons.	*Duty per ton.*	*Total duty paid.*	*For 5 years past cost per ton, including duty.*	*Total cost including duty.*
Swedish and Russian	29,486	$22 40	$660,486	95 00	2,801,170
English bar iron	3,332½	37 00	123,302	75 00	249,938
Sheet, rods, &c.	1,168	78 40	91,571	130 00	151,840
	33,986		$875,359		$3,202,948

By the above statement it appears that the average duty on all the iron annually imported, is less than $26 per ton.

The following statement shows the annual consumption of iron in this country, as per report made to the convention of manufacturers of iron, lately held in Philadelphia.

In 1830 there was made at 202 furnaces	155,348
Of which was made into castings	28,273
Tons	127,075
Which rendered into bars, at 28 cwt. per ton, would yield	90,768
There was made of bloomed iron	5,853
Total bar iron made annually in the United States	96,621
Add the quantity imported	33,986
Annual consumption of bar iron, in the United States	130,007
Besides what is made from the blast furnaces into castings	28,273
Iron consumed in the United States annually	158,280

Though the duty on a small portion of the iron imported is high, yet, as we have shown that the *average* duty is less than $26 per ton—while the proportion of the iron imported that pays $37 per ton duty is less than one-seventh of the total im-

orts, though it sells at 20 per cent. less than any other iron, and that part which ays a duty of $78 40 is only one-thirtieth of the entire importation.

But when we compare the quantity of iron consumed in this country that pays a duty of $37 or $78 40 per ton with the total consumption of bar iron, to say nothing about iron made into castings—it sinks into insignificance. The proportion of that paying $37 duty being only 1-39th part, while that paying a duty of $78 40 is only 1-112th part: to which if we add the iron made from the blast furnaces into castings, it will sink still lower.

In order to ascertain the actual duty paid per ton on iron, in the shape of hardware, we have taken an account of all our imports of hardware from June to November this year, as well as those of another hardware house for the same time, viz. Messrs. Hyers:—the result is as follows—

	cost stg.	*tons and parts.*	*duty paid.*	*duty per ton.*
G. & W. imports	£4,314	59 15 1 6	$6,180 24	$103 40
Heyers	5,710	69 19 1 4	7,112 02	104 50

The approximation of the duties paid per ton, by the Messrs. Heyers and ourselves, renders it certain that the above is as correct a view of the average duty paid on hardware as could be obtained*—from which we draw the following results:

There was imported of hardware in 1828--9	$3,346,146
The duty upon which, estimated as paid in the two importations above mentioned, is 30 per cent.	1,003,843
The weight of which, taking the two importations stated as the data, was 9,763 tons.	
If the American manufacturer of hardware had his iron at the average rate duty paid on iron, it would have been, on 9,763 tons, at $26 per ton	253,848
And he would have received a clear protection of	$749,995

That is, the importer of the manufactured article would have had to pay four times as much duty as the manufacturer who imported the raw material and worked it up here—or, if the manufacturer of hardware had imported his iron, and paid the duty as on English iron, of $37 per ton, as calculated by the memorialists, he would have paid $361,231

And received a clear protection of $642,612

That is, the importer of the manufactured article would have had to pay nearly three times as much as the importer of the raw material, who worked it up here.

From the above statement of facts, the reader can judge how much weight should be given to what the memorialists say, as to the exclusive protection given to the raw material over the manufactured article.

8th. Under this head the memorialists recommend that pig iron should be admitted free of duty. They exhibit a calculation, to show that if pig iron was admitted free, that bar iron could be made here at $40 per ton. We will examine the correctness of these statements upon their own ground. We imported a parcel of pigs from England about the time the memorial was written, and so have the expenses of importation, which are as follows: There are two iron districts in England—Wales and Staffordshire; we will take the price of a ton of pigs in Wales, as it is less there, and more favorable to the memorialists.

Cost of 1 ton pigs in Wales	£3 5 0
Freight and insurance to Liverpool	0 8 0
Charges at Liverpool	0 1 8
Export duty	0 0 4
2½ per commissions for purchasing	0 1 9
	3 16 9
Exchange, insurance, 8¼ per cent.	0 6 6
Freight to New York	0 10 0
	£4 13 3

*It included every article usually imported, subject to specific as well as ad valorem duty, anvils, &c. &c. No part could probably be a more fair specimen of the whole imported.

	£4 13s. 8d ls	$20 70
Cartage in New York to store		50
Merchant's commission and storage 5½ per cent.		1 05
Transportation to nearest works		3 00
		25 25
28 cwt. to make 1 ton bar iron		10 11
Cost of pigs to make 1 ton bars		35 36
200 bushels of charcoal to convert pigs into blooms, at 5 cents		10 00
Labor on do.		7 00
175 bushels of charcoal to convert blooms into bars		8 85
Labor on do.		5
Re-transportation to market		3 00
Water privileges, dam, and overseeing		2 00
		$71 21

Cost of bar iron made of imported pigs, free of duty, and this the memorialists say could be made for $40 per ton, and if puddled, less. We have shown that it could not be done for any thing like the money with charcoal; neither could it be puddled, as we know by experience. The consequence of a repeal of the duty on pig iron would be, not that we could make bar iron here at $40 per ton, but it would cost us $71 21, which is more than we now pay for iron imported from England, made of the *same* material, and, in doing so, would destroy all the furnaces within the influence of the imported pig iron.

That pig iron could be imported, free of duty, cheaper than we can make it in this country with charcoal, is without question; but suppose it to be admitted free, what would be the consequence? From these pigs we could either make an iron that would suit our wants, or we could not. If it were good enough for general use, all the furnaces within the reach of its influence must stop, of course, because they would be undersold, the selling price of American pigs being from $28 to 40. If it would not make a better article than we now import from England made of the *same* pig iron, we should not want more than we now take; for if the quality was adapted to our wants we would consume it now, its price being a sufficient inducement. By granting the prayers of the memorialists to admit pig, boiler, scrap, blooms, &c. free, and bar iron 25 *per cent. ad val.* duty, it is manifest that we must either substitute an inferior article of English iron in place of that made in this country; or, if we can make a better article from the pigs than they do, we will cause a considerable portion of our furnaces to stop, which would destroy more capital and throw out of employ more individuals than would be employed in manufacturing hardware, in very many years.

By granting the fourth, you would destroy those manufacturers of wire who have commenced since the tariff of 1828, in the faith of the government; one of whom told us that he can make this year wire enough to supply the United States, and sell it at a less price than it can be imported.

By granting the last, you would cut off all inducements to the manufacture of steel, which we think (and we have given the subject some investigation with a view to manufacture), can and will be successfully accomplished. Lastly, what would be the state of our country in case we had to depend upon a foreign supply for so necessary an article as iron, and especially when our main dependence would be upon England, who, in time of war, could blockade our ports, stop supplies, and cause greater evils than the nation we think is willing to expose itself to?

From the preceding statements it is manifest, that the quantity of iron manufactured in this country is not inconsiderable, as the memorialists call it– but is about four times as much as is imported in any shape, which is more than is made in any other country excepting England, more than 2½ times as much as is exported from Sweden, and as much as was made in England at the beginning of this century.

The amount annually manufactured in the United States is		*tons* 158,280
While the amount imported in bars, &c. is	33,968	
Imported in hardware	9,763	
		43,731
The value of American iron, as per report of the committee on the ject of iron appointed by the convention lately held in Philadelphia, is		$11,444,410

While the value of that imported in bars, &c. including the duty is	3,202,948	
Value of the iron in 9,763 tons, imported in the shape of hardware, estimated at the same rate as the above	678,670	
		$3,881,618

From which it appears that the total quantity of iron imported in every shape, is about 1-4 of what is made here, and its value about 1-3

It is incumbent upon the memorialists to show whence we are to get a supply to meet the deficiency occasioned by the suspension of a large portion of our furnaces. For our part, we do not see how we could get a supply, unless we could make a better article out of English pigs, than they send to this country. Any one who is acquainted with the situation of Russia, with respect to the quantity we could get from thence, and the practicability, under the existing state of society and civil government, would think an increase of 10,000 tons a large calculation. Sweden exports only 50,000 tons per annum, that being the total quantity the law allows to be made for foreign consumption, as each factory is confined to a certain quantity in proportion to the wood land owned; and the wood land that is proximate enough to be used for iron making, has been brought into use for that purpose long since. Of that 50,000 tons we take 20,000, and a considerable portion of the remainder, say 10,000 tons (including the steel iron which the English monopolise), goes to England; the remaining 20,000 tons goes to the continent; so that we cannot get much more from thence without paying more for it than others can pay. But suppose we can get from Sweden an increased supply of 15,000 tons; there remains unsupplied yet upwards of 71,000 tons, which the memorialists will please inform us where to obtain, unless the price should advance enough to enable our own manufactories to go into operation again? In which case the proposed change would be of no avail.

We will conclude with showing the comparative value to the country of the present manufacture of iron and of hardware. If we should make all the hardware we consume and import the iron for it, as proposed by memorialists.

Made in the United States 158,230 tons iron value		$11,440,410
Total amount of hardware imported, value	3,346,146	
The value of the 9,763 tons iron to be imported to make this hardware, would be, free duty	390,520	
		2,955,626

They would, therefore, nearly destroy the manufacture of an article valued at $11,440,410 to establish one valued at 2,955,626, even if we allow that all the hardware now consumed could be made in the United States.

We think we have proven in the foregoing statements—

1st. That the quality of English iron, instead of being good as the memorialists represent, is the worst iron in use.

2d. That the duty on iron in bars, &c. instead of being from 6 to 11 times higher than the duty on iron imported in the shape of hardware, as stated by the memorialists, is but 1-4 as high, inasmuch the average duty paid on iron in bars, rods, sheets, &c. is $26, and that imported in the shape of hardware is $104 per ton.

3rd. That the quantity and value of iron, actually manufactured in this country, is not insignificant in amount, as there is made here per annum 158,000 tons $11,440,410
While that imported in the shape of bars and hardware is 43,731 tons,
value, including the duty 3,881,618

And of course the statement made by the memorialists is not true, that there is only made in the United States 35,000 tons, and imported 81,000 tons.

4th. That by granting the prayer of the memorialists you would almost annihilate the manufacture of an article which has grown up under a protection to the value of $11,440,410, to establish one of $2,955,626. Yours respectfully,

GREEN & WETMORE.

STATEMENT G.

New York, October 31st, 1831.

B. B. HOWELL, ESQ.

Dear sir—In conformity with your request I herewith give you a statement of the iron produced in Litchfield county, Connecticut, with the manufactures of iron and steel, in said county; to which I have added the other productions of the county,

as estimated by the delegates to the convention from that county. It may not be perfectly accurate, as a portion of it is founded upon conjecture; but the total will rather fall short of than overrun the true amount, as a very considerable list of articles, each of small comparative value, are entirely omitted.

I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN M. HOLLEY.

	Value.		*Value.*
Pig and bar iron, &c.	$293 000 00	Brought forward	$451,700 00
		Shoes and boots	112,000 00
Manufactures of iron &c.		Carriages and wagons	38,000 00
Scythes	$56,000 00	Clocks	382,000 00
Hoes	7 150 0	Leather	181,000 00
Axes	26 500 00	Cabinet work and chairs	27,000 00
Rat and mouse traps	9,500 00	Cordage	500 00
Shoe tacks and sparables	40 000 00	Machinery, part wood and part	
Shovels and spades	6 500 00	iron and steel	19,000 00
Augers	200 00	Brick, clay furnaces and mar-	
Steel	8,000 00	ble	38,200 00
Pitchforks	20 000 0	Rakes and brooms	5,000 00
Ploughs	3,800 00	Lime	5,000 00
		Musical instruments	2,200 00
	$177,650 00	Buttons	20,000 00
		Cheese	115,000 00
Other productions.		Butter	17,600 00
Wool	$151,000 00		
Woollen cloths	215 000 00		$1,414,200 00
Cotton do.	15,000 00	Pig and bar iron	293,000 00
Hats	70,700 00	Manufactures of iron, &c.	177,650 00
Carried forward	$451,700 00	Total	$1,884,850 00

Statement H.

MANUFACTURES OF DELAWARE COUNTY,* PENNSYLVANIA.

To the delegates to the convention to be held at New York—

The committee appointed, in pursuance of a resolution adopted at a meeting of citizens of Delaware county, convened agreeably to public notice, in Chester, on the 17th inst. "to ascertain the number and extent of the different manufacturing "establishments in the county; the quantity of manufactures produced; the quantity "of raw material consumed; the number of hands employed," &c. &c. Report—That, from the short time to which they were necessarily limitted, they have been unable to collect that full and complete information on the subjects committed to them which the importance of these interests require. But referring the delegates for more minute details of the distribution of our manufacturing and mechanical industry, to a printed report (a copy of which is enclosed), taken by Benjamin Pearson, esq. under the direction of a committee appointed for the purpose in 1826, your committee offer the following statement, made up of such details as they have been able to procure, in addition to their personal knowledge of facts, and they believe it will prove in the aggregate not far from correct.

JOHN P. CROZER, *Chairman.*

October 22, 1831.

*This small county contained 14,810 inhabitants in 1820. [*Per. Com.*

Mills and Factories.	*Quality manufactured per annum.*	*Kind.*	*Value per annum.*	*Persons employed.**	
4 Rolling and slitting 2 Nail factories	1,400 tons	300 tons sheet iron 600 „ nails 500 „ hoops	$45,000 81,000 60,000	205	
4 Tilt mills		edge tools, spades and shovels	21,175	30	
18 Paper mills	41,000 reams	various	215,000	400	
18 Cotton spinning	1,080,000 lbs.	yarn	300,000	720	17,350 sp.
3 Cotton weaving mills	800,000 of yarn into	ticking, muslin, &c.	350,000	400	420 power looms.
Woollen mills	900,000 lbs. of wool	flannel and satinetts	300,000	350	
		Totals	$1,372,175	2,185	

STATEMENT I.

REPORT ON STEEL.

On the subject of steel, your committee reports, that, as no preparation whatever had been made for collecting information antecedent to this convention in New York, they are not able to supply it from any other source than what is attainable in this city. They have no time left for collecting and collating tabular statements, or statistical reports, of the quantity of steel imported, and manufactured in this country: nevertheless, enough information has been acquired in the course of a day, to satisfy the committee, that the article in question is one that requires the continued protection of government. The committee assume the principle, that, if steel can be manufactured now, or within a few years, to supply the wants of our own citizens at a reasonable price, it cannot be an object towards which the legislature will be indifferent, and it is deemed expedient that even the limited information now produced, should be disclosed, in order to encourage reflection and secure that consideration which the article of steel unquestionably merits.

Without seeking further, the members of your committee are enabled, from their recollection, to enumerate fourteen steel furnaces in the following places, viz.

Pittsburg 2; Baltimore 1; Philadelphia 3; New York 3; York county, Pa. 1; Troy 1 New Jersey 2; Boston 1.

These furnaces are known to be now in operation, and of a capacity sufficient to supply more than 1600 tons of steel, annually;† an amount equal to the whole importation of steel of every kind. But it should be observed that steel for common agricultural purposes, is not the best, although it is most used; and that American is *quite equal* to English steel, used for such purposes in England. American competition has excluded the British common blister steel altogether. The price of blister steel is less than it was before 1828, and probably as low as it ever will be:—certainly as low as it ought to be, having a just consideration for the manufacturer and his customer. The only steel now imported from Great Britain is of a different and better quality than that just mentioned. It has been the laudable pride of American legislation to advance with the increasing enterprise of the people, and to encourage discoveries of those mineral treasures, towards which that enterprise might be profitably directed. The committee having shown the result of such countenance from government in the instance of common blister steel, may be allowed, to anticipate the effects of its continuance; and that protection will be hereafter acknowledged as the parent of perfection.

*Including families.

† Mr. Coates has subsequently requested the chairman of the permanent committee to add the following note:

This calculation is believed to fall far short of the quantity of steel made in the United States. It appears that the 14 furnaces have only one *batch*, or blast, in a month—whereas two weeks are sufficient for conversion of iron into steel.

Steel imported here from all parts of the world, except England, (although the German steel is freely employed in some branches of manufactures) amounts, to so inconsiderable a quantity that the competition for ascendency in our own market must rest between that nation and this. We already supply ourselves to her exclusion, with common steel, and to give some idea how extensively it effects our manufactories, the committee will state two or three striking facts. The iron of this country, when properly made, has been found equal in quality to the Russian and Swedish iron used in England for conversion into steel, and being so converted, is employed in making large and rough implements of manufacture and agriculture. It is used in the fabrication of plough shares; it is worked up by shovel makers, among whom one in Philadelphia uses more than fifty tons a year. Scythe makers are among the best customers of a steel furnace, and cross-cut and mill saw makers use more than any other manufacturers. One factory of this kind in Philadelphia, requires a ton and a half of steel *per diem*, for every working day of the year. These isolated instances may give some idea of the vast consumption of seel in the numerous factories of the United States, and for this purpose alone they are stated.

The English however, continue to supply us with the superior qualities. These are

1st. Blister steel, from iron of the Danamoura mines in Sweden.

2d. Sheer steel, of the same origin.

3d. Cast steel.

As to the first, being the best quality of blister steel. A house in Hull monopolises all the iron made from Danamoura ore, under a contract by which the parties in Sweden are to forfeit 10,000*l.* sterling, if they sell to any body else—so that no other European country can furnish a good file without resorting to England for the steel that is made of Danamoura iron; this excelling all others in Europe for files and many other instruments. The British manufacturers, aware of the advantages of their monopoly, continue to exact the same price for their steel delivered in America, that they did before the duty on the Swedish iron was reduced in England from 28 8S to $6 66 per ton—thus proving that an article whose low duty approaches nearest to no duty, (almost "free trade") is charged to this country at a rate no less than before the reduction of duty took place in England.

It is, however, a cause for congratulation here, that iron of similar or equal quality to that which has thrown all the advantages of manufacturing the best articles of cutlery into British hands, has been made recently by improved processes from the ore of Juniata, and both sides of the line between New York and Connecticut. The latter denominated the Anerum, the Livingston and the Salisbury ore. Steel is now made at Pittsburgh, and may be made in New York and Connecticut, bearing a fair comparison with the best hoop L (L) or Danamoura steel, that comes from England. No difference is observed where trials have been made without disclosing to the judges the origin of either. Two establishments, one in New York, and another in Pittsburgh, have justified this statement, and encouraged a hope that the products of our own mines, smelted by means of modern improvements in the construction of furnaces and application of the blast, and elaborated by machinery lately introduced, will rival the best quality of steel that England can furnish.

The second kind of first quality British steel is called "sheer steel." This is nothing more than blister steel drawn under a tilt-hammer into bars of the various sizes used in the fabrication of some articles of cutlery, and the finer kinds of edge tools. England has hitherto monopolised this branch also, from being in possession of the only European steel that would bear the expense of preparation; and from the perfection of her machinery. She has now the honor of transfering a portion of her experience and skill to the United States. Her workmen in steel, wanting employment or adequate recompense for labor at home, continually seek them among us; and it is believed that these may be afforded to such an extent as to yield them support commensurate with their industry—and that ingenious men, who, under other circumstances might have been compelled to pursuits not congenial with their education, or to be dependents upon public bounty, will become useful citizens, instead of idlers and beggars in the land.

The third kind of steel, best quality, is called "cast steel," and this is made from the best blister steel, only. There is none made in the United States. Several attempts to make it with profit, have proved unfortunate.

The causes of failure were—

First—The want of best quality blister steel (of which only it can be made), at a reasonable price.

Second—The want, or expense, of crucibles of proper quality, wherein the blister-steel is to be melted and smelted.

The first difficulty may be surmounted by the discovery that iron, well made from the ores of Juniata, New York and Connecticut, may he converted to the hest hlister-steel: and the second difficulty is helieved to hc at an end, since the explorations of the presenl year have disclosed the existence of clay analagous to that of Stroubridge, which is considered the hest in the world for crucibles. Centre, Clearfield and Lycoming counties, (Pennsylvania), have yielded large specimens of clay that satisfy geologists, mincralogists and chemists, of tbe identity of its properties with those of Stourbridge. Clay, in the vicinity of Baltimore, has heen successfully employed in the manufacture of fire hrick, and may prohably be used for the manufacture of crucihles for cast steel, if properly prepared. The great impedimenis to the making of cast steel has not arisen from any mystery in the art, but the want of strength in the crucihles. Black lead, and a variety of clays, have heen tried, but the weakness of tbese materials have hitherto caused a loss to the manufacturer, hecause the crucihles made of tbem would not bear moving when the melted metal was in them, (generally about 28 lbs.) The Stourhridge was the only kind of clay that possessed the requisite qualities of preserving its shape and soundness when exposed to the greatest heat, and its strength and tenacity when moved for the purpose of discharging the melted metal. Capital, enterprise and perseverance will he engaged to hring this desirable material, so indispensahle to the finer arts of cutlery and machinery, into market—if protection be continued to the efforts which our citizens are willing to make.

If these views are correct—we have steel for agricultural purposes in the greatest abundance:—We have steel, (sheer steel), for nicer purposes, and we may have cast steel for tbe most refined articles of manufacture, among ourselves. But this is not all, we may export our steel to Rossia, Prussia and France, in competition with England herself; and thus justify the further importation of foreign commodities wbich we can have the means of paying for. The suhject of steel becomes more interesting as our investigation of it advances; hut it is believed that the facts and inferences now set forth, will suffice to continue the protection already granted, and to procure time for more extensive practical developement, which, if realized, will add to the means of domestic employment and heneficial intercourse with foreign nations.

[The preceding report on steel was presented hy Mr. *John R. Coates*, of Philadelphia, to whom this branch of the subject had heen specially referred, for a collection and arrangement of the facts; as was that on iron, proper, to Mr. *B. B. Howell*, of New York, by the general committee on the manufactures of iron.]

GENERAL RECAPITULATION.

[*By the Permanent Committee.*]

		By the report.	*Supplementary returns*	*Total.*
Bar iron made in the United States,	*tons*	96,621	16,245	112,866
Pig iron, the whole quantity made being computed as such	"	163,542	27,994	191,536
Value	*dollars*	- - -	- - -	13,329,760
Men employed	*number.*	24,979	- - -	29,254
Persons subsisted	"	124,895	- - -	146,273
Annual wages	*dollars.*	7,493,700	- - -	8,776,420
Paid for food furnished by farmers	"	3,415,850	- - -	4,000,490

The following statement may be useful in making comparisons, and is therefore added:

The importation of Manufactures of Iron and Steel in 1830, *were* :

Side arms and fire arms, other than muskets and rifles,	$179,153
Drawing knives, axes, adzes and socket chisels,	29,007
Bridle bits of every description,	62,271
Steel yards, scale beams and vices,	30,899
Cutting knives, sickles, scythes, reaping hooks, spades and shovels,	95,004
Screws weighing 24 lbs. or upwards,	17
Wood Screws,	66,817
Other articles not specified,	2,908,978
Muskets, No. 8,341,	25,142
Rifles, " 8,	85
Iron and steel wire, 592,733 lbs.	59,485
Tacks, brads and sprigs,	2,799
Nails, 613,704 lbs.	40,906
Spikes, 37,873 lbs.	1,391
Cables and chains, and parts thereof, 540,628 lbs.	25,885
Mill cranks and mill iron, wrought, 2,781 lbs.	200
Mill saws, 4,395 lbs.	12,252
Anchors, 22,672 lbs.	1,121
Anvils, 677,246 lbs.	31,249
Hammers and sledges, 75,616 lbs.	3,096
Castings, 1,157,256 lbs.	38,686
Braziers' rods, 218,428 lbs.	5,945
Nail and spike rods, 32,848 lbs.	784
Sheets and hoop, 2,326,796 lbs.	59,822
Slit or rolled for band, scroll or casement rods, 2,845 lbs.	81
In pigs, 22,499 cwt.	25,644
Bar and bolt, rolled, 138,981 cwt.	226,336
Hammered, 68,752,943 lbs.	1,730,375
Steel, 24,472 cwt.	291,957

Nearly all the iron, with its manufactures, imported, was received from England, except of the hammered bar and bolt iron, of which 21,912,702 lbs. were from Russia, 45,206,082 lbs. from Norway and Sweden, 984,399 lbs. from England—leaving less than a million of pounds for all other places.

FRAUDS ON THE REVENUE.

The committee, to whom was referred, the resolution "to inquire and report upon any evasions of the existing revenue laws,"—

RESPECTFULLY REPORT.

That, in attending to that duty, they have found a difficulty in obtaining as complete a statement of facts, as it is desirable to present. Full and satisfactory evidence, has, however, been produced, to satisfy their minds of the existence of extensive frauds; but from the nature of the subject entrusted to them, few facilities were afforded to substantiate, at this time, by direct testimony, all the various devices which are resorted to for the purposes of evading the payment of the full amount of duties established by law. On application, by letter, addressed to the appraisers in this city, by your committee, for such evidence as they possessed,—these officers refused to furnish it, except under instructions from the secretary of the treasury:—but their application to the collector met with more favor, their inquiries having been promptly and satisfactorily replied to by that officer.

The principal evasions of the revenue laws have been made in the importation of broad cloths. By the law of 1828, every yard of imported woollen cloth, six quarters wide, costing six shillings and nine pence, sterling, may be legally entered at the dollar minimum. Every yard 6-4 wide, costing more than 6*s*. 9*d*. sterling, and not exceeding 16*s*. 10*d*. must, in conformity to that act, be entered at the two dollars and fifty cents minimum. In the first case the duty is 67½ cents per running yard—in the second case the duty is $1 67½ cents. This part of the law is thus particularly stated, in order to show the manner in which it is evaded. The law of 1830, passed expressly for the purpose of enforcing that of 1828, has hitherto but partially effected that object;—it has been the means of developing the extent of the evil, rather than of arresting it.

This has been owing, in some degree, to the American opponents of the protective system—who have endeavoured to render that law as odious as possible; in which they have received material aid from those foreigners who are extensively engaged in importing—and from the agents of foreign manufacturers resident in this city. Some of the journals, opposed to protection, have also lent their aid to disparage the law; denying the existence of frauds, and thereby rendering the execution of it unpopular. Even some of the persons whose duty it was to enforce the law, joined in the cry that it was oppressive, and spoke openly of it as iniquitous and unjust.

Your committee are informed, and believe, that four fifths of all the importations of dry goods into this port are on foreign account; and in the particular article of woollen cloths, seven eighths of the whole amount are thus imported.

The value of the importations of broad cloths by four of these foreign agents, amounted, in the last twelve months, to one million and a half of dollars. Either from the force of public opinion, that no frauds existed, or

from the ingenuity and management of those who committed them, but few frauds were discovered during the first year of the operation of the law of 1830. But little variation from the former practice of sending cloths to the public stores for appraisement, was adopted by the collector of this port. As formerly, and in general, only one package out of each invoice was sent for examination—which package, your committee believe, was properly examined; but singular as it may appear, that one package of cloths was generally invoiced at a price which made it liable to the duty on the two dollars and fifty cents minimum—at which price there was little or no inducement to defraud, since cloths, costing and entered under that minimum, are consumed in much smaller quantities, and because these must produce, on the average, five dollars per yard to pay cost of importation.

It is obvious from this circumstance, that the attempts at fraud were almost wholly confined to cloths at the lower, or one dollar minimum,—few of which were sent to the public stores for examination. To explain this more fully, it is important to state, that invoices were made up abroad to complete this mode of evading the examination of the cloths at the dollar minimum, by sending to the consignee, here, one case in each invoice of the higher priced cloths already named, or one that was fairly charged at 6*s.* 9*d.* and *managing* to have that alone selected as the one case out of the invoice to be sent to the public store, in compliance with the law and the practice abovementioned:—keeping back the other packages which, although invoiced at a price that would admit them to entry at the one dollar minimum, but which had actually cost from 20 to 50 per cent. higher, and ought to have paid duty on the two dollars and a half minimum. Thus it has been ascertained, that, in six months immediately preceding the first of April last, one foreign concern entered, at the custom house in this port, more than four thousand pieces, or about eighty thousand yards of broad cloths, which, with the exception of about three hundred pieces, were entered at a value, per invoice, not exceeding 6*s.* 9*d.* sterling, and these, for want of a thorough examination, were allowed to be entered at the one dollar minimum. These cloths produced, in this market, from three dollars and a quarter to four dollars and a quarter, per yard; while cloths, honestly invoiced and legally entered at the one dollar minimum, it is well known, did not bring more than from two dollars seventy-five cents, to three dollars per yard—thus satisfying your committee that the government must have been defrauded of more than thirty thousand dollars on these importations;—and proving that the cloths which were sold at from three and a quarter to four and a quarter dollars per yard, were fraudulently introduced into the country: unless we are willing to admit the absurdity, that this market was kept fully supplied with cloths during a whole season, *either* at an enormous loss to the importer, or else at an extravagant profit, varying from thirty to seventy-five per cent.

Your committee are the better satisfied of the fact that these cloths were fraudulently entered, from the knowledge they have obtained, that, as soon as they were put into the possession of the parties entering them, all the marks and numbers by which they might be identified, were generally removed. In a late instance, a number of pieces of cloths were seized in an auction store in this city, under information given to the collector that they had been falsely entered; and when they were examined, it was found that the original marks and numbers, by which they might have been identified, had been taken off and others substituted. What the object of such prac-

tices are, your committee leave the public to judge. In further proof of this allegation, the collector of this port, being fully convinced that these modes of evading the revenue laws were carried on to a great extent, and being urged to adopt, as the only method of correcting the evil, the examination of entire invoices, has, during the last five or six months, caused all the cloths invoiced and attempted to be passed at the dollar minimum, to be sent to the public stores for examination:—the result of which has been, that about three thousand pieces of these cloths have been adjudged by the appraisers to have been undervalued, and to have cost from 7*s*. 6*d*. to 8*s*. sterling; consequently rendering them liable to the duty on the two dollars and a half minimum:—and, extraordinary as the fact is, in all but a few cases, the importers, after detection, have been permitted to enter their goods on paying only the duty under the advanced minimum, instead of being subjected to forfeiture, according to law.

One house, alone, has paid about fifteen thousand dollars additional duties on cloths thus put up; others five and six thousand dollars,—others smaller amounts; and only the very trifling and inconsiderable amount of about a dozen packages, during the past year, has been libelled,—and but one adjudicated on, which was condemned. Your committee feel themselves bound to express, in the strongest terms, their disapprobation of such an execution of the laws. Can stronger evidence be adduced of the *intent* to defraud the revenue by such importers, than the fact, that they will and do pay, when so detected, one dollar and sixty-seven and a half cents the running yard duty on cloths, which they have just sworn that the cost in England entitled to entry at 67½ cents per yard?

Your committee not only believe the *intent* to defraud the revenue is thus apparent—but they are further convinced, that PERJURY is thus frequently committed with the greatest impunity!

Your committee take the liberty of pursuing this particular subject a little further. The investigations made have convinced them, that, notwithstanding the quantity of cloths thus found undervalued by the appraisers and put up by them, to the next highest minimum was very great; yet many hundreds, if not thousands of pieces have been allowed to pass as correct, in consequence of the standard of value, at the custom house, of the dollar minimum cloths being from 6*d*. to 2*s*. sterling per yard, below the value of said cloths, in the market from whence they came. This has been (as your committee believe), one of the principal causes why the collector has preferred the course of enforcing the payment of the extra duty of one dollar the yard, rather than libelling, and taking the risk of condemnation, when the appraisers had only estimated them at 6*d*. or 1*s*. sterling undercharged—although, in fact, from 2*s*. to 4*s*. sterling undercharged; and had they been so put up, by the appraisers, the *intent* to defraud would have been so manifest that there could have been no hesitation on the part of the collector, to libel; but as, in most instances, they were only raised a few pence, the intent to defraud was less visible, and might not, in his opinion, be sufficient to be relied on for condemnation.

Among the evidences that have produced conviction on the minds of your committee, that the statements above made are true, the following are submitted:

In May last, two of your committee, with one of the most extensive American importing merchants, made application to the collector of the port, to be shewn any cloths that were then in the public stores, that had been

stopped by the appraisers as undervalued—he promptly and politely acceded to their request, and accompanied them to the stores, where a number of bales were shewn to them, and they examined five or six, which they estimated to have cost as follows:

1	package	7*s*. 9*d*.	to	10*s*.
1	"	8*s*.	"	10*s*. 6*d*.
1	"	9*s*.	"	9*s*. 6*d*.
2	"	10*s*.	"	10*s*. 6*d*.

Supposing that, as the appraisers are bound by law to estimate the value of the cloths in each package, by the best piece in it, and as the whole were much above the standard of the dollar minimum cloths, or 6*s*. 9*d*. and the best pieces full fifty per cent. higher, they took it for granted that all would be libelled and condemned. It has, however, now come to the knowledge of your committee, that none of them were libelled (although all of them were marked up, as they were estimated by the appraisers to have cost but 7*s*. 6*d*. except one which was estimated at 7*s*. 9*d*.) and the whole were permitted to be entered and the duties paid, under the two dollar and fifty cents. minimum. Here is, certainly, a very strong case, proving the very low standard by which the appraisers must have been governed, it being from 2*s*. 6*d*. to 3*s*. per yard, (nearly fifty per cent), below the judgment of one of the most extensive American importers in the United States. The appraisers being bound by law to take the best piece in the package as the value of the whole; but there were two packages, in which there was but little variation of price, estimated as above at 10*s*. to 10*s*. 6*d*. the yard, which the appraisers only rated at 7*s*. 6*d*. to 7*s*. 9*d*.

Stronger presumptive evidence could not readily be adduced, that the prices affixed to the above named cloths by the appraisers, were much lower than their actual cost. It is not probable that the mere difference of 9*d*. sterling the yard, which brought them under the higher minimum and subjected them to the payment of one dollar the yard additional duty, would have been submitted to by all the consignees or owners, when they could have been returned to England, from whence they came (as has been permitted, though contrary to law,) at a much less loss than to have paid the extra duty and sold them here—as 6*s*. 9*d*. cloth would pay cost and all expenses of importation, if it brought two dollars and seventy-five cents per yard; but a 7*s*. 6*d*. cloth (and only 9*d*. more cost), if entered according to law, must bring four dollars the yard to pay the cost and charges. That it would not bring any such price, by at least seventy-five cents the yard, is well known to all buyers;—the loss would therefore be seventy-five cents the yard.

If a cloth that cost in England 9*s* to 10*s*. is only estimated by the appraisers at 7*s*. 6*d*., it is a fair, and in the opinion of your committee, a pretty conclusive evidence, that the cloths that really cost 7*s*. 6*d*. to 8*s*. and invoiced at 6*s*. 9*d*. would be allowed an entry at that price, without being detected; and that they have been, in hundreds of instances, there is not a shadow of doubt, or this market would not have been so liberally supplied with cloths selling at from three to three and a half dollars per yard.

Your committee deem it important to state further, that, in their opinion, the greater part of the cloths which have been raised by the appraisers from about 6*s*. 9*d*. the dollar minimum, to from 7*s*. 6*d*. to 8*s*. have subsequently been allowed an entry by the officers of the revenue, at the two dollars and

a half minimum, have been admitted to entry in direct violation of the law of 1830.

This opinion seems fully confirmed by the circumstance, that, although this mode of raising the valuation of them was allowed by the law of 1828, that law subjected the cloths to fifty per cent. additional duty, while the law of 1830, in doing away this provision of the law of 1828, evidently substitutes seizure and confiscation in case fraud shall be detected. It is evident that so long as the practice prevails of only marking up goods that are found undervalued, the greatest possible inducements are held out to attempt frauds; since, in case of discovery, the party attempting fraud is not placed in a worse situation, after being detected, than he would have been in, had he honestly complied with the law. In either case, he would only pay the duty to which cloths are lawfully subjected. While this laxity in the administration of the law prevails, attempts will be continued to evade it.

That the evil now exists is established by the fact that, of the numerous cases in which attempts to enter goods at an under valuation have been detected by the appraisers, but in a few instances, as before remarked, have the goods been libelled; and, in but one instance, have the penalties of the law, by forfeiture, been enforced.

While the statements already made by your committee, prove the great cause they have to complain of the manner in which the revenue laws have been administered, another cause of complaint arises from the established mode of computing the rate of duty. By instructions from the treasury department issued to collectors, immediately after the tariff law of 1828 went into operation, the duties which by that act were required to be assessed on woollen goods were diminished, and the practice of charging a less amount of duty than is required by law, has been continued to the present day. In the attempt to find analogy between those sections of the law which impose duties on cotton cloths, the secretary of the treasury gave what your committee deem an erroneous construction to the law.

The terms of the law are explicit, and require the collection of forty-five per centum *ad valorem* on the several minimum valuations which it establishes, and it goes on further to state, that, on all ad valorem duties, 10 per cent. additional shall be added thereto, if the importations are on this side the Cape of Good Hope, and twenty per cent. additional if beyond it. But the practice has been, under this false construction of the law, to omit this addition of ten or twenty per cent. intended to be levied, thus abandoning the ad valorem principle, as relates to woollen goods, whilst adhering to the principle on the raw material, wool. As the duties are now levied, *wool pays sixty-five per cent., and cloths forty-five.*

The late secretary of the treasury, not being satisfied with the construction which had been given to the law by his immediate predecessor in office, as related to the ten per cent., made a report to congress in which he suggested the propriety of a declaratory act on the subject, by that body.—The committee do not perceive the necessity of legislative instruction on this point, as the secretary of the treasury is bound to administer the law according to the meaning of the terms in which it is expressed. The evil of the present construction of the law is so great, and, in the opinion of your committee, the construction given so erroneous, that they cannot but hope that the interpretation which to them seems correct, may also soon be adopted by the present secretary of the treasury.

In respect to frauds on the importations of silk goods, a description of merchandise of small bulk, extensive variety and great value, according to the statements made to your committee by respectable American importers, great evasions of the revenue laws have also taken place; but as the prices of the various fabrics of silk, so essentially depend on the peculiar diversities of fashion and manufacture, it is more difficult to ascertain the actual cost, or market value, of such fabrics in foreign markets, than of any other of the staple imports of the country.

From the collector, as well as many other highly respectable individuals of this city, your committee are informed of numerous and extensive evasions of the revenue laws in the importation of iron. By a trifling variation in the form of the imported article, or under the names of scrap iron, railing, pallisading, &c. large quantities of iron have been introduced, which paid a duty of only eight or ten dollars per ton, when the duty, as it has been stated, would have been as high as from thirty-seven to seventy-eight dollars per ton, if it were imported under the proper names of rolled or hammered iron, braziers rods, &c.

It has appeared to your committee, that a public inquiry, by order of congress, into the mode of administering the revenue laws at the different custom houses, would afford such information as to lead to the enforcement and better execution of the laws. No sea port of this country has afforded so favorable an opportunity for executing fraudulent designs as the city of New York, where from twenty to thirty ships, from foreign ports, frequently arrive in the course of one week, and greater expedition is demanded in their unlading, and passing their entries through the custom house, than is consistent (as at present organised), with the just and careful execution of the revenue laws. Many entries, your committee believe, are made out with fraudulent intent, and the amounts carried out designedly wrong, in the expectation that in the hurry in which they are passed, they may escape detection.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

PETER H. SCHENCK, *chairman.*

New York, November, 1831.

The committee on frauds consisted of Messrs. P. H. Schenck, E. Elsworth, and J. B. Murray, of New York; J. B. Brown, of Boston; Z. Allen, of Providence; L. Waln and B. Reeves, of Philadelphia; and J. T. Barr, of Baltimore.

MANUFACTURE OF HATS.

Mr. Crolius from the committee appointed "on the subject of the manufacture of hats, and the materials used in the production of the same"—

REPORTED:

That, although the committee had not been able, in so short a time, to collect all the materials which so extended a branch of manufacture requires that its importance may be made manifest to this convention and the people of the United States, they ask leave to present the following summary views, which, they are entirely satisfied from the testimony before them, are *within* the amount of production and employment caused by this manufacture.

The home consumption of hats made in the United States, is per annum, equal to	$10,000,000
Exported	500,000
	$10,500,000

Say, ten millions five hundred thousand dollars, as the annual value of the manufacture of hats.

And, on the information of practical men, extensively engaged in this business, they have reached the conclusion, that eighteen thousand persons are directly employed in this business, viz:—

15,000	men and boys,
3,000	women.
18,000	

Who receive, in money, paid for their labour, the sum of four millions, two hundred thousand dollars a year—$4,200,000.

The materials used in the manufacture of hats consist of wool, of various qualities, and of furs, which are of domestic and foreign production; also gums shellac and seed lac, glue, sulphuric and nitric acids, copperas, verdigris and dye woods—with trimmings of leather, cloth and silk, of foreign or domestic manufacture.

It is now about thirty years since the first duty was laid on imported hats; and since that time, (that the domestic manufacture might be encouraged and thereby established), the original duty has been considerably increased, by which American hatters were first enabled to make a stand against foreign manufacturers, and finally to drive them out of the market, by furnishing better and cheaper hats than the people of the United States had been supplied with, before an adequate protection was afforded in the duty levied on hats; the *exports* of which now make a handsome item in the treasury statements. A foreign hat is rarely seen in our country, except in the use of persons just arrived from foreign places, because of the imposing fact, that American hats, regard being had to their quality, are manufactured at a less price than must be paid for them elsewhere. Such are the results of protection ex-

tended to the hatters of the United States, that it directly employs 18,000 persons, who earn in wages 4,200,000 dollars, or, at an average of nearly 240 dollars for every person, per annum—and subsists, in the whole, from 50 to 60,000 individuals; and all this, while the consumer receives a better article at a reduced price.

But, to guard against foreign speculators and excessive supplies of foreign hats, your committee consider it essential to the interests of American consumers as well as manufacturers of hats, that the present duty should be fully maintained. Though not very high in its amount, it is *effective* in its operation, and the consequences have been as just stated—the principle of which your committee believe is equally applicable to other important branches of domestic industry: But do away that protection, and the *irregularity* on the home market would throw thousands of hatters out of employment, who, with their families, are now comfortably subsisted by the labor of their hands.

The committee would in conclusion remark, that the duty on foreign wool (which is extensively used by them, certain kinds being much better fitted for the manufacture of hats than our own), is equal to 65 per cent. on its cost, while the duty on hats is only 30 per cent., and the excess duty on wool, so far as it goes, has an injurious effect; they therefore would suggest such increase of duty on hats, and especially on hat-bodies or hat-felts, made in whole or in part of wool, as may meet the duty imposed on the material used—which they believe would be advantageous to the American people in general.

All which is respectfully submitted.

CLARKSON CROLIUS, *chairman.*

The manufacture of caps is also a very extensive and important interest in the United States. There is one factory at Albany which, in dressing and preparing furs and skins, and in the making of caps, employs about six hundred persons, on an average, throughout the year, and pays out 2,000 dollars in weekly wages, or 100,000 dollars per annum, for labor only.—There are two or three other factories of such articles at Albany—and several in other places. The whole value of the manufacture of hats and caps in the United States, (for men's wear) may be put down as equal to about $15,000,000—fifteen millions of dollars a year.—[*Permanent committee.*]

ON THE MANUFACTURE OF SALT.

The committee on the manufacture of salt, beg leave to REPORT—

A

A statement shewing the condition of the salt business in the United States, in 1829 *and* 1830.

STATES.	*Fixed capital, lands, furnaces, vats, &c.*	*No. of persons employed.*	*No. of bushels annually produced.*	*Average cost per bushel.*	*Average price per bushel at the manufactory.*	*Gals. water per bushel*	*Probable quantity of wrought iron used per annum.*	*Probable quantity of cast iron used per annum.*
	Dollars.		*Bushels.*		*Cents.*		*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Maine	22,000		90,000		37½		4	
New Hampshire	3,000		1,200		40 a 50			
Massachusetts	1,754,576		567,239		39 a 48			
Rhode Island	5,400		1,600		50			
Connecticut	5,000		2,000		45			
New York	3,077,000		1,291,220		45	45		
New Jersey	7,000		7,000		50 a 75			
Pennsylvania	400,500		600,000	35	45		15	*45
Delaware	2,250		7,500		30			
Maryland	20,000		38,000		30			
Virginia	1,000,000		1,061,000		37½	70	50	*200
North Carolina	96,600		31,860		30 a 75			
South Carolina	9,000		3,000		50			
Ohio	334,762		446,350		37 a 50	95	29	66
Kentucky	160,000		137,320		50 a 75	95	20	45
Tennessee	3,000		3,640		75a100			
Alabama	3,000		4,000		62½			
Illinois	53,000		138,000		40 a 75	80	8	25
Arkansas	3,000		10,000		75a100	80		
Florida			4,000					
Indiana	7,000				125			
Missouri								
	6,964,988		4,444,929				126	381

Key West is a new source for the production of salt. Ponds have been made, the production of which, in a year or two, will supply, if the expectations of the owners are not greatly disappointed, from five to eight hundred thousand bushels per year.

* To many of the wells is annexed a steam engine of about two tons weight.

B.

Prices of Salt in the city of New York.

Year.	Turks Island.	Year.	Turks Island.
	cents.	1818	68 a 70
1806	62½	1821	58
1807	50 a 55	1824	53 a 55
1808*	60 72 a 100	1825	50
1809, '10, '11 and '12	75 a	1826	49 a 50
1813	100	1827	55 a 57
1814	fine $2 a 2 75 per bushel.	1828	48 a 50
1815	various.	1229	47 a 48
1816	65 a 70	1830	42 a 45
1817	60 a 62	1831, October 29,	58

[This table, as reported by the committee, contained returns of the prices of Liverpool and Lisbon salt, in a few of the years stated; but as that of Turks Island is complete for every year, and is, itself, the best scale whereby to form a correct judgment of the value of salt, we have taken it alone—and it is fully sufficient for the purposes intended.]—*Per. Com.*

C.

Salt imported into the United States from the 1st of September, 1825, to the 30th of September, 1826, and from the 1st of October, 1828, to the 30th of September, 1829.

WHENCE IMPORTED.	*From Oct. 1, 1825, to Sept. 30, 1826.*			*From Oct. 1, 1828, to Sept. 30, 1829.*		
	Quantity bushels.	*Value dollars.*	*Cost cents.*	*Quantity bushels.*	*Value dollars.*	*Cost cents.*
Swedish West Indies	6,482	1,227	18.6	2,129	212	10.0
Danish West Indies	4,653	481	10.3	171,126	13,770	8.6
Dutch do. and American colonies	58,503	6,167	11.5	68,221	6,902	10.1
England	2,354,549	429,932	18.3	2,935,215	455,743	15.3
Ireland	90,666	11,947	13.2	60,901	11,470	18.8
Gibraltar	68,773	8,090	11.8	49,162	5,133	10.4
British West Indies	979,905	108,304	11.1	1,065,581	98,143	9.2
British American colonies	33,903	6,484	16.3	2,350	1,181	50.0
Hanstowns and ports of Germany	5	2	40.0			
Fr. Eu ports on the Mediteria'n	15,362	1,493	9.4	49,040	4,278	8.7
French W. I. and Am. colonies	2,412	402	16.7			
Other French ports	9,759	1,052	10.8			
Spain on the Atlantic	65,756	5,279	8.0	172,214	12,658	7
Spain on the Mediterranean	20,080	1,892	9.4	113,100	7,286	6.4
Cuba	6,334	795	12 6	17,363	1,498	8.6
Other Spanish West Indies	2,768	373	13.5	9,432	800	8.5
Portugal	749,674	84,166	11.2	1,000,615	81,376	8.2
Italy and Malta	12,591	994	7 9	69,090	4,149	6
Trieste and other Austrian ports	8,673	553	6.4			
Colombia	3,348	1,000	29.9			
Brazil	7,750	1,017	13.1	7,856	879	11.2
Europe generally	6,861	1,044	15.2			
Africa generally	1,367	261	19.1			
South Seas	1,686	115	10.6			
Hayti				1,400	200	41.3
Madeira				21,930	1,850	4.4
Fayal and other Azores				4,422	480	10.8
Cape de Verd Islands				41,337	4,171	10
Turkey, Levant and Egypt				28,961	2,125	7.3
West Indies generally				4,102	324	7.1
Total	4,564,720	667,058		5,945,547	714,618	

*From 1808 to 1815 inclusive, the foreign commerce of the United States was much interrupted by European orders and decrees, with our embargo and non-intercourse laws, and the war; and the prices in those years are not intended to come into an exact and fair comparison—though it was proper to state them. Early in 1815 the price at Baltimore was as high, for some time, as six dollars per bushel.

Per. Committee.

	1826.			1929.		
Great Britain and her dependencies	3,533,796	cost	564,757	4,114,047	cost	566,537
From all other places	1,030,924	"	102,201	1,831,500	"	148,081
	4,564,720		667,058	5,945,547		714,518
From England and her dependencies beyond the amount received from all other places	2,502,872		462,456	2,282,547		418,456

D.

Abstract, shewing the quantity of Salt imported into the United States, from the commencement of the government, to the 30th of September, 1829.

YEAR.	*Bush. imp.*	*Duties.*	*Year.*	*Bush. imp.*	*Duties.*
From the commencement of the government to 31st Dec. 1791	5,257,456	630,895	do 1809	360	42
From 1st Jan. to 31st Dec. 1792	1,779,510	213,341	do 1814*	379,112	75,822
do 1793	2,027,332	247,622	do 1815	4,311,763	855,449
do 1794	2,958,411	361,128	do 1816	5,367,470	1,076,933
do 1795	2,823,718	345,770	do 1817	2,975,995	594,496
do 1796	3,670,077	443,550	do 1818	3,557,625	714,466
do 1797	2,977,902	391,134	do 1819	3,823,410	765,537
do 1798	2,755,534	544,206	do 1820	4,010,569	803,913
do 1799	2,513,411	488,617	do 1821	3,121,847	624,369
do 1800	3,421,819	687,387	do 1822	3,538,323	707,664
do 1801	3,608,948	686,454	do 1823	4,449,740	889,948
do 1802	3,872,905	702,838	do 1824	3,092,092	618,410
do 1803	3,542,872	721,355	do 1825	4,578,538	915,707
do 1804	3,433,996	686,799	do 1826	4,564,720	912,944
do 1805	3,782,328	765,804	do 1827	4,320,535	
do 1806	4,262,704	862,694	do 1828	3,962,957	
do 1807	597,033	731,508	do 1829	5,945,547	1,188,109
do 1808	48,954	6,017	do 1830	5,374,046	
			do 1831	5,500,000	*estimated.*

E.

An exhibit of the quantity of Salt imported into the United States in 1826 and 1829; also the quantity re-shipped during the same, with the quantity of salt manufactured in the United States in those years.

	Bushels.
Imported from the 1st of October, 1825, to the 30th September, 1826,	4,564,720
Re-shipped during the same period	30,680
Consumed	4,534,040
Quantity of salt manufactured in the United States in 1826, taken from document No. 47, of the senate, printed January 21st, 1828,	4,113,000
Total	8,647,040
From the treasury report of the 5th of February, 1829, the importations of the year ending the 30th of September, amounted to	5,945,547
Re-shipped during the same period	44,890
	5,901,157
Quantity of salt manufactured in the United States in 1829, as shewn by Table A.	4,444,929
Total	10,346,086

*No duties having been collected during the omitted years, no means exist of ascertaining the quantity imported.

F.

The Importations of 1831 is estimated at about five and a half million of bushels. By comparing the present price of salt, with a duty of 10 cents per bushel, it will clearly be seen, that the consumer was supplied with this important and necessary article of consumption, taking the years 1824 to 1830, at 50 cents, when the duty was 20 cents per bushel. By the prices current of the present year at a duty of 10 cents, the consumer will pay an advance of 20 per cent. See B. This establishes one plain fact, that instead of the reduction of the duty on salt, supplying the citizens of the United States at a lower rate, it has had the effect, from the vacciliating policy of the government, to discourage the necessary exertions of those who are concerned in this important branch of American industry, which, of course, has produced the difference in price. Your committee think they hazard nothing in saying that if the duty on salt was entirely taken off, the price would increase in the ratio of the present year, to at least seventy-four cents per bushel, as in former years when no duty existed.

G.

As a source of revenue, and as an encouragement to the domestic manufacture, the first congress which assembled under our present constitution were induced, on the 20th July, 1789, to pass an act imposing a duty of six cents per bushel on salt imported into these United States. At the next session, 1790, it was increased to 12 cents per bushel.

These enactments operated as a bounty for individual enterprise. Not, however, in the estimation of congress, equal to the hazard of investment. In 1797, the duty on foreign salt was augmented to 20 cents per bushel. This proved insufficient to call forth the capital and enterprise of our citizens: necessity seemed to require that congress should act on every article that appeared to languish, under what was then called a protecting duty. Despairing of its ultimate success, on the 3rd March, 1807, salt was declared free of duty from and after 1st January, 1808. This continued until 1st January, 1814. During these years, as per appendix B. salt ranged from 50 to 100 cents per bushel higher than any other period from or since the formation of the government, (the period of the war, excepted). It may be worthy of remark, that the same act which renewed the duty for the encouragement of our own manufactories of salt, gave the bounty or drawback on the fisheries.—The war of a second independence brought forth the energies of the country, and, from the close of that struggle down to the repeal of the last act laying a duty on salt, it ranged lower than at any other period since the adoption of the constitution.

General *Washington*, in December 1796, used the following language—

"Ought our country to remain dependent on foreign supply, precarious because liable to be interrupted?

Mr. *Jefferson*, in 1808—

"The suspension of our commerce, produced by the injustice of the belligerent powers and the consequent losses and sacrifices of our citizens, are subjects of just concern. The situation into which we have been forced, has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal manufactures and improvements, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming, will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and subsistence, the freedom of labour from taxation with us, and of protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent."

In 1816 he wrote thus—

"That to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them, at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures, must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that nation, or be clothed in skins and live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say I am not one of them."

Mr. *Madison* in 1809, says—

"That it is not unworthy of reflection, that the arbitrary edicts of contending nations, to obstruct our trade with them, have so far abridged our means of procuring the productions and manufactures of which our own is now taking the place."

In his message of 1815, he said—

"There is no subject which can enter with greater force into the deliberations of congress, than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufac-

tures which have sprung into existence in the United States during the European wars."

See Mr. *Monroe's* message 1821—
Again 2d Dec. 1823:—"I recommend a review of the tariff, for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defence and independence of our country."

Your committee have no means of ascertaining the number of persons employed in the manufacture of salt. Judging, however, from the amount of capital as per schedule A, which is *seven millions of dollars*, the number must he very considerable. It is a remarkable fact, as far as comes to the knowledge of your committee, that in no one instance has the people petitioned congress for a repeal of the salt duty. They are satisfied with obtaining this article of necessity at the lowest possible price. All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. BRUEN, *chairman.*
A delegate from the county of Kanawha, state of Virginia.

New York, 31st Oct. 1831.

The *Permanent Committee* believe that some additional statements concerning the manufacture of salt, may be useful.

A petition to congress, on behalf of the manufacturers of salt, in the county of Kanawha, Virginia, signed Lewis Summers, Joel Shrewshury, sen. Lewis Ruffner, James Bream, Joseph Lovell, A. Donnally, and Isaac Noyes, dated 9th Jan. 1828, and published by order of the senate, Jan. 21, 1828—stated, among others, the following facts, which are briefly condensed, for common reference.

In the early settlements of the western country, salt was as high as $5 per bushel, and for several years it fluctuated from 2 to 3 dollars; but the works at Kanawha, being commenced, it fell to 1 dollar. And, even during the last war with Great Britain, such was the domestic competition, that it averaged less than 87½ cents—though selling at 5 or 6 dollars on the sea-board. In some instances, it rose to one dollar, (at the works) because of the great demand for the north-western army, and the operations of speculators—but increased production enabled the manufacturers to extend their supplies to new customers, and considerably checked a general increase in price. At that time 12,000 bushels were made weekly at Kanawha.

Since this period, the salt works in the western country have been much increased—and so great was the competition, and *large the supply*, that salt was sold as low as 15 or 20 cents per bushel, in casks ready for shipping, in 1825—and in 1826, even at 12½ cents. This necessarily caused a stoppage of many of the works. There were 61 wells, of a capacity to supply 100 furnaces, but only 56 were in operation. The average price of 1827 is stated to have been 24½ cents, and the actual cost of manufacturing, including barrelling, &c. 19½ cents. The salt made, was 787,000 bushels, employing 471 regular laborers, using 1,695,000 bushels of coal in the evaporation of 64,000,000 gallons of water. The capital employed was estimated at $548,000, and the agricultural products annually consumed by the working people valued at $47,600—using 24½ tons wrought iron and 108½ tons cast iron, and paying for mechanics bills 7,950 dollars a year. We recite these particulars to shew how one branch of industry interlocks itself with others. And further, should be added the labor and cost of transportations, in making barrels,* and building wagons, boats, &c. employing many and various other persons. In this petition, the whole products of the salt works of the United States, for 1827, were estimated at 4,113,000 bushels—one half of which were in the western country. By the returns of the marshals in 1810, the quantity of home-made salt reported was 1,238,865 bushels, worth 1 149,725 dollars; or almost one dollar a bushel in that year, *when there was no duty on salt.*—See the table of average prices, marked B—and it will appear that the duty has not had any apparent effect on prices—nor do we believe that it has had any real one; for a brisk domestic competition acts against the foreign supply, and reduces cost to consumers, and so it has been in respect to every class of *protected* articles.

* 130,000 barrels, costing 32,000 dollars, were required.

Of the 4,564,720 bushels imported in 1826 no less than 3,533,796 bushels were from Great Britain and her dependencies—2,354,549 from England, direct.

The petition above referred to, contains some powerful reasoning against the then apprehended reduction of the duty on salt; but the Permanent Committee believe that their present business is confined to the facts as stated; and do not wish to pass from them into argument just now.

On the 22d day of October 1830, the salt manufacturers of Kanawha again petitioned congress for a restoration of the duty on salt.* They estimated the capital vested in this manufacture at 6,964,988 dollars, and shewed the capacity of the United States to increase domestic supplies: they computed that 3,653 persons were directly employed in the business,† who, among a multitude of supplies from the farmer, required about 600 tons of iron annually. They state a fact of ordinary occurrence, though seldom sufficiently noticed by political economists and statesmen—that, on a failure of supplies from Kanawha, (which had kept down the prices at from 45 to 50 cents), *foreign* salt, at Cincinnati and Louisville, immediately advanced to 75 cents. But the extraordinary exertions of the Virginia manufactures, (*stimulated by the high price*), soon brought it down again. They say that the protection given to domestic salt has not diminished the foreign trade in the article—as the tables shew. Its chief effect has been to reduce the price of salt; the diminished price being the loss or profit to *foreign* manufacturers. A large part of the salt brought to the United States is imported in lieu of ballast. The price of iron, salt or molasses, for examples, has never risen, (unless for a moment) because of higher duties imposed—nor the price of molasses, salt or coffee permanently declined, because that the duties have been lessened. Practical results are decidedly against the theory, that duties *must* needs be "taxes." It is the force of the domestic competition, which settles that question; as is fully shewn in the report of the committee on the manufactures of iron; and other facts known to every man of business, who has examined the subject.

A memorial to congress from sundry inhabitants of Massachusetts, published by order of the house of representatives, Jan. 23, 1827, presents the following facts:

That, during the revolutionary war, salt was sold for three or four *silver* dollars per bushel—that after the war, the manufacture increased, until the duty was taken off; but the state of Massachusetts, (recollecting "revolutionary sufferings"), to aid the manufacturers, exempted the salt factories from taxation. In 1813, the duty of 20 cents per bushel being laid, the manufacture revived, and became extensive—great improvements being made in it, to save labor as well as advance the quality of the article. The water is pumped into vats from the ocean—and the vats are covered to avoid the effect of rains, or of dews, at night. In Barnstable county, only, there were then 15,000,000 feet of such vats, worth $1,300,000, and having more than 1,000 owners. The price of salt which had been as high as 60 cents, having fallen to 33 cents at the works, the competition between the domestic and foreign supply, in the language of the memorialists, became "severe"—and they asked congress "what good reason there could be for destroying their only manufacture?" &c.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

In the year ending Nov. 1828, 1,160,000 bushels of salt were made at Salina, Syracuse, Geddes and Liverpool, in the state of New York. This paid a revenue to the state of 12½ cents per bushel; and left a clear profit for the year of $188,620.

From March 1827 to June 1829, the monthly product of salt at Kanawha, was 75,000 bushels—inspected.

In 1829 the Kiskeminetas salt works in Pennsylvania, employed two hundred road wagons.

At the beginning of the year 1831 there were 17,545,760 square feet of salt works in Massachusetts.

The following brief notices of the salines on the Kanawha, as generally applicable to those west of the mountains, are interesting.

At the point where the salt factories are established, the Kanawha river is about

*A law with a prospective effect having passed to reduce it.

† They, and their families were estimated at 14,612 persons—subsisted by the manufacture of salt.

150 yards wide. The "salt region" extends 15 miles along the river, and the quantity of salt manufactured may be extended to an indefinite amount.

The salt water is obtained by boring through a great rock, to the depth of from 300 to 500 feet. Copper or tin tubes are introduced to keep out the fresh water, which lies above the salt,—and the latter rises as high as the surface of the adjoining river, though all communication with it is cut off. The salt water is then raised to the top of the bank of the river, about 40 feet, by forcing pumps, and conveyed to the furnaces, as required. Bituminous coal abounds on the spot, and is used for the purpose of evaporating the water. Some of the salt water thus obtained, is so strong that it will hold very little more salt in solution.

These works at present, employ about 800 men, as salt-makers, coopers, boat-builders, &c. The average price of salt has hardly exceeded 30 or 35 cents per bushel, at them. By means of the Baltimore and Ohio rail road, and other channels of cheap transportation, supplies of salt may be obtained from the west in future emergencies—such as happened in the last war.

The Kanawha salt is purer than the Liverpool.

Prices of Salt at Baltimore.

	March 27, 1830. Duty 20 cents.	*April* 19, 1831. Duty 15 cents.	*Dec.* 9, 1831. Duty 15 cents.
Turks Island	45 to 47	50	53
St. Ubes	44 " 45	none	53
Cadiz	40 " 41	42 to 43	none
Lisbon	43 " 44	43	"
Liverpool, (ground)	40	not quoted	40
" (sack)	205 to 213	200 to 215	200 —

The fishing business in the waters of the Chesapeake, failed last year, and there was some excitement, because of the stock of salt on hand, and its anticipated fall in price, on account of the reduced duty to take place on the 1st January last—but the salt in the hands of the fishermen rather made a profit than a loss, when the duty retired five cents a bushel! And now, (Dec. 9) we see, that though the duty will be only 10 cents on the 1st of next month, the price of Turks Island salt is six cents higher than it was in March 1830, when the duty was 20 cents, and 3 cents higher than when the duty was 15 cents, which duty will be only 10 cents, three weeks hence. There has been a small decline in the price of Liverpool salt, in sacks of 4 bushels, since March 1830—but all other salts show no other change since that time except against consumers.*

*When it was proposed to repeal the duty, Mr. *Vinton*, of Ohio, stated, in the house of representatives of the United States, that a reduced duty would not affect the cost to consumers, though destroying a large amount of domestic capital and employment.

Mr. *Doddridge*, of Virginia, said that he had seen $12 given in his country for a bushel of alum salt, and recollected when it was reduced to $5, because of the improvement of the mountain roads—but that the price remained at three dollars until the Kanawha works displaced the *foreign* article. He had seen the time when 24 bushels of wheat would not pay for one of alum salt—and, at the same place, he had seen salt so reduced in price that a barrel of it would not pay for a barrel of flour. He supposed that a bushel of foreign salt had not been consumed in more than half of his (congressional) district for the fifteen preceding years; and thought if such salt was wholly excluded, the whole quantity required would be furnished without inconvenience.

Mr. *Reed*, of Massachusetts, referred to many proceedings of the revolutionary congress to encourage the manufacture of salt, and at the date of these resolutions, he said that the business had been commenced in his neighborhood—by evaporating sea-water. That the capital now vested in the manufacture in Massachusetts amounted to 1,754,576 dollars—making annually 503,686 bushels of salt, equal to the best alum or Turks island. That the repeal of the duty in 1807, though almost ruinous to manufacturers, rendered only a small and temporary benefit to consumers. That there were more than 800 small factories in his district—whose competition had reduced the price to 30 cents for 56 lb. of salt,--[the duty then being 20 cents on that quantity]; and he estimated the whole capital employed in the domestic manufacture at eight millions of dollars.

The salt made at the factories in Massachusetts weighs about 75 lbs. per bushel; and in 1828, sold for 38 cents. The capital vested in them was estimated at about two millions of dollars.

The duty on Salt.	*Price—Turks Island.*
In 1789 6¼ cents	
1790 12	
1798 20	67
1807 duty taken off	50 to 55
1813 20 cents renewed*	50 to 100
1816 20 cents—act extended	65 to 70
1830 20 from Jan. 1, and	45 to 47
1831 15 from Jan. 1	50 to 53
1832 10 [to be] from Jan. 1.	53 [Dec. 9, 1831.

The whole facts shew—that the amount of the duty had no apparent effect on price, and favor the opinion, that a diminished duty has rather had a tendency to increase the profits of *foreign* manufacturers and embarrass the operations of *home* manufacturers, by rendering the market uncertain, than to diminish cost to *consumers*.

To exemplify this we shall state the duties upon and prices of molasses, at different periods—the supply of that article being also of domestic and foreign production.

1827	duty 5 cents.	price 33 to 35 less the duty	29
1828	10	30 to 31	20½
1829	10	26 to 27	16½
1830	10	30 to 31	20½
1831	5	29 to 30	24½

The preceding are taken from the Baltimore prices current of Dec. in each year given, and have reference to the same quality of West India molasses; the price of which declined in the West Indies when our duty was increased, and advanced there when the duty was reduced. Such are the operations of trade; which we expect to show hereafter in numerous instances, and offer the *reasons* for them. It is sufficient to observe, for the present, that such they are.

NEW YORK PRICES.

In support of the opinions just advanced, we shall add the following statements, derived from Mr. *E. Williams'* valuable work, the *New York Annual Register*, given in anticipation of the volume for 1832, which is speedily to be published.

Prices of Coal, Salt, Coffee and Molasses.

The following table exhibits the prices in the New York market on the 1st December in each year (except those of 1820 and 1822, from which returns have not been obtained) since the last war, of Liverpool coal, Turks Island salt, West India coffee and molasses, (average price,) with the duties payable on the same articles—

	Coal per Chaldron.		Salt per bushel.		Coffee per lb.		Molasses per gallon.	
Dec. 1	Price	Duty.	Price	Duty.	Price	Duty.	Price	Duty.
1815	$23	$3 60	90 cts.	20 cts.	25 cts.	10 cts.	70 cts.	10 cts.
1816	14	1 80	60	do	21	5	50	5
1817	11	do	60	do	24	do	60	do
1818	11	do	70	do	30	do	53	do
1819	14	do	do	do	24	do	40	do
1820		do	62	do	29	do	30	do
1821	14	do	60	do	28	do	33	do
1822		do	do	do	25	do	do	do
1823	12 75	do	52	do	20	do	26	do
1824	15	2 16	50	do	17	do	28	do
1825	14	do	58	do	16	do	33	do
1826	10	do	49	do	15	do	30	do
1827	13	do	62	do	14½	do	33	do
1828	13	do	52	do	13	do	28	10
1829	11	do	45	do	12½	do	25	do
1830	8	do	55	do	12	do	30	do
1831	13	do	62	15	12½	2	30	5

* Limited to the duration of the war.

REPORT ON THE CURRENCY.

The committee charged by the convention of the friends of domestic industry, assembled in New York, in the month of October last, to "report upon the currency of the country, as affecting or affected by the protecting system," beg leave to present the following Report—

That to render clear and intelligible any statement they may make in relation to the "currency" of our country, as it may affect or be affected by the "protecting system," it is necessary to give to those terms a definite and distinct meaning, that will be recognized at once as just, when applied to the system of trade and political economy existing in the United States.

By the term "currency" they understand the medium of exchange used by contracting parties, in the interchange of commodities which are the product of labour, when direct barter or the exchange of one commodity for another, of supposed equal value, does not take place: But where time or space intervenes between the delivery of articles, that are the subjects of a contract, the written evidence that is given of the contract is the medium of exchange, and its transferable quality gives to it the character of currency.

By the term "protecting system," the committee understand such regulations of *foreign* commerce as shall protect our country from purchasing and importing, either voluntarily by its own citizens, or having forced into it by foreigners, an amount of the product of the labor of other countries, for which the product of the labor of our own will be insufficient to pay, when sold in foreign markets; and thereby prevent the accumulation of a *balance of trade* against the United States, that, if paid at all, must be paid by gold and silver: articles of commerce, the value of which is regulated like the value of all other articles of commerce—by demand and supply.

However some modern political economists may attempt to ridicule what is termed the "balance of trade," the committee do not entertain a doubt of its existence, as certainly between nations and communities of people, as between individuals of the same community;—nor that the amount of this balance determines as certainly the amount of gold and silver which a nation can retain, as it decides the amount that an individual can hold. Every person knows that the effect of contracting debts to an amount that his own income will not pay, must create a balance against him, to pay which he will first have to part with his money: secondly, with whatever other articles of value he may possess; and if these be insufficient to satisfy his engagements, that nothing but the humane policy of our institutions will save him from becoming the slave of his creditor, and being compelled to earn the amount of his contract by the sweat of his brow:—The bond having been fairly given, nothing but the inability of the debtor

can release him from the fulfilment of his contract; and so with a community of debtors.

The committee are aware that our custom-house entries do not furnish any rule that can be relied upon to determine whether a balance of trade exists against this country or not. They furnish a tolerably accurate account of the quantity of the product of our labor exported, but give no data by which to ascertain the amount, in money, which that product of labor has sold for in foreign markets. The custom house entries probably, do furnish a reasonably correct mode of ascertaining the cost, in foreign countries, of the product of foreign labor, imported into the United States. The difference in amount, in money, between our exports and imports, as ascertained by their sale and purchase in foreign markets, is the true balance of trade.

To these preliminary remarks the committee will add what they suppose will be admitted by every one—that the product of labor alone is wealth—that all exchanges of the product of labor are commerce—that gold and silver are products of labor, to which coinage adds no increased value—that coined gold and silver alone are money—that money is but a legal measure of value possessing the peculiar quality of expansion, in the same proportion that the material of which it is constructed is diminished in the market—that currency is but the evidence of debts—that one hundred days labor employed in Carolina, in extracting from the earth *two thousand and twenty-five* grains of gold, worth seventy-five dollars; and one hundred days labor in Pennsylvania, employed in extracting from the ore one ton of malleable iron, worth seventy-five dollars; and one hundred days labor employed in New York, in cultivating the soil and producing one hundred bushels of wheat, worth seventy-five dollars, have each contributed to the common stock of wealth an equal amount, and that the relative quantity of gold, iron, or wheat produced, at each of these places, by a given quantity of labor, establishes the value of labor or its product, at the place where it is rendered.

From the definition which has been given of currency, it will be perceived that the committee confine this term to such a medium of exchange as possesses merely the character of a *representative* of value—and that nothing else can be considered currency. In conformity with this opinion, money, or coined gold and silver, is not currency, because it is composed of the product of labor; and, as such, is an article of commerce, in even more universal demand than any other article which is the product of labor, because any other product of labor will, in every country, be given in exchange for it: but this is barter, and requires no medium of exchange.—It is a mere exchange of one product of labor for another, and is made in the same way and governed by the same principles, that one bushel of wheat is given for two bushels of Indian corn, or five pair of shoes for one hat.—No medium of exchange, or currency, is used in such transactions—one article of the product of labor being directly exchanged for another of equal value.

It has been already said that currency is but the evidence of debts—and that it consists of contracts to pay, or deliver, at some stated time and place, a stipulated quantity of wealth, or the product of labor, and most commonly money; the quantity of which is defined by the number of grains of gold or silver which the laws require shall be contained in dollars or eagles; a certificate of which number is impressed upon each, by coinage; and, that these coins alone are money.

To give contracts promising the delivery of wealth, or payment of money, the character of currency, they must be transferable, so as to invest the holder with the right to demand and enforce a fulfilment of the contract. Bonds, notes and bills, whether payable to bearer, or to any one or his order or assigns, on demand, at sight, or at some future period of time, or at some distant place, and certificates of stock, constitute currency—which is not money, as used in the United States, but consists wholly of contracts to pay money. It is not the product of labor, and therefore has no intrinsic value. It is, however, an article of commerce, because a product of labor has been given for it; and because it is to be redeemed with a product of labor.—But there is the same difference between currency and money, that there is between the evidence of a fact and the fact itself.

As an article of commerce within our country, (and it is not an article of commerce elsewhere, with the exception of some of the public securities) —currency has its value defined by the price it will sell for, in gold and silver; and this is ascertained, *first* by the degree of confidence which is reposed in the ability of the party contracting to pay; *secondly*, by the opinion entertained of the moral sense which will induce him to comply with his engagements; *thirdly*, by the certainty with which the laws will enforce a compliance, if his moral sense shall fail to effect this object; and *fourthly* by the place where the payment is to be made.

Currency is the aliment on which banks, brokers and dealers in money subsist. They affix a value thereto at their own descretion—as for instance, to a bill drawn at New York, payable at Philadelphia, on demand or at sight, for one thousand dollars, they would attach the value of one thousand dollars, less the expense of transporting the money from Philadelphia to New York, and the interest on the money for two days, the time that would be occupied in obtaining payment; or if it be a bill or note, payable twelve months after date, they would attach a value of less than nine hundred and forty dollars to it, and so in proportion for any greater or less time that might exist between the date of the note or bill, and the time it would become due. But a bill drawn at New York, payable at sight in London, for the equivalent of one thousand dollars in the currency of London, would at this time be worth in New York about eleven hundred dollars, exchange on England being ten per cent. above par. Whereas a bill drawn for one thousand dollars, payable in some other foreign place, might be worth not more than nine hundred dollars—exchange on such place being as much below par. Thus the currency of the country is of innumerable degrees of value, and worth just what it will sell for, when brought to market for money.

Contracts promising the payment of money are, in fact, bills drawn upon the gold and silver that may be at the place where they are made payable. And gold and silver being articles of commerce, the value whereof depends like that of all other articles of commerce, upon demand and supply, the value of currency must always fluctuate in the same ratio that gold and silver fluctuate in value, when these are measured by other descriptions of wealth or products of labor. As an example of this kind, we will suppose that a bill of exchange had been drawn in the United States, and made payable sixty days after sight, in London, for a gold sovereign, which, at the time the bill was drawn, was worth but four dollars and forty-four cents in London; or an equivalent that we will call five days labor; and that when the day of payment arrived, one half the gold that was in England had been,

during the interval between the date and maturity of that bill, transported to the continent, in consequence of an adverse course of trade; then the same sovereign which, at the date of the bill, would have commanded but five days labor, would, at its maturity, command ten days labor—for in this ratio the value of money would rise and labor fall, in pursuance of immutable principles in the laws of trade, which regulate values by demand and supply, of universal and invariable application.

Currency that is based upon wealth, to be ascertained and measured by articles of commerce, such as gold and silver are, must fluctuate, as we have shewn, in the same degree that the articles upon which it is based shall augment and diminish in value. In further illustration of this position, we will suppose that when a country contained thirty millions of dollars, in gold and silver, and one day's labor would purchase one dollar, a man contracted to pay one hundred dollars, at twelve months after date; and that between the date and maturity of such contract, fifteen millions of the gold and silver were transported to other countries from that in which the contract had been made, then, the money that remained would increase so much in value, in consequence of its diminished quantity, there being no diminution in the demand, that it would require two hundred day's labor to satisfy that contract—whereas, one hundred day's labor would have discharged it, when the contract was made—the value of labor, in relation to articles uninfluenced by the foreign market, having fallen precisely in the same ratio that the value of money had advanced.

Still it must not be supposed that the fluctuations in the value of currency, caused by its being based upon an article of commerce, or the product of labor, present any argument against that basis; for the fact of its being based upon an article of commerce alone imparts any value to our currency. If it were not based upon something of intrinsic value; that is, upon something into which labor has entered, it would possess no value—for what would a contract to pay nothing be worth, even if the contract be fulfilled to the letter? It would still command nothing, and would not exchange for any thing that could add to the comfort or happiness of man: the whole object in the acquisition of wealth.

It would be impossible to state with any degree of accuracy, the amount of wealth which has accumulated in the United States since the first settlement of the country; which should be estimated by the quantity of labor that has entered into its construction, including both the wealth which is attached to the soil, and that which is floating and might be transported to other countries. Nor is it important that a conjectural estimate should be offered—for it is upon that portion only which is in the possession of the debtors of the country, that our whole currency is founded. And this portion of wealth, under the due execution of the laws, is pledged for its redemption, in money—and whilst our laws are duly executed, if the property of debtors will not purchase money at one price, to fulfil their engagements, it must at another. The general currency cannot therefore depreciate until that security shall be exhausted; or until the laws which enforce the obligation of contracts shall be impeded in their operation—contingencies not likely to take place, whilst the state governments are prohibited from passing any law that would impair the obligation of contracts, and the government of the United States shall protect the industry of this nation.

As currency is but the *representative* of value or wealth—in order to render its character still more clear, let it be supposed that a person has employed one thousand days' labor to construct a house; and that his necessities required, after he had constructed this house, that he should have one thousand articles, each of which it had cost one day's labor to create, at a time when coined gold and silver, or money, was so abundant that one day's labor would exchange for or purchase one dollar—and that, to obtain these articles, the owner of that house entered into one thousand separate written contracts to pay to one thousand different persons, or to their order, one dollar each, which he gave for the one thousand articles which his necessities required, and that he thus transferred his property in that house into currency—and so gave to the holders of this article of commerce a claim upon his house, by which they might become its legal owners, if he should fail to redeem his contracts in the time and manner stipulated. But, as these contracts for one dollar each may have been made payable at sixty days after date; and as the holders of these contracts may wish to exchange them for products of labor, they may effect this indirectly by selling them to banks, brokers or dealers in currency, for other contracts; which will enable the holders to obtain, promptly, such products of labor as they may want, even money itself, if they choose to call for it, in dollars or parts of dollars.

In such transactions the house, or the value thereof, represented by the original contracts, performs the functions of currency; whereas under a system of barter, or mere exchange, without the employment of currency, the property vested in the house could not become a circulating article of value. In the case we have stated, the security given by the owner of the house to the holders of his original notes, that had entered into the general currency, consists of the house itself, and such other contracts, or articles the product of labor, as he received in exchange for the notes or contracts that he had made; and this security is worth precisely what, under any circumstances, it could be sold for. It might happen that the value of money would be double, before the day of payment arrived, by reason of the quantity being diminished one half; and then the value of the house, which it occupied one thousand days' labor to create, would be diminished one half, and would sell for but five hundred dollars. Yet the products of one thousand day's labor, which the owner received in exchange for his notes or contracts, being still in his possession, would also be worth five hundred dollars—but not more. And although these two resources would enable him to redeem his one thousand original contracts for one dollar each; he, nevertheless, would lose his estate, in consequence of the rise in the value of money, caused by the diminution of its quantity, between the date of his contracts and the time they became due—and hence the appalling effects upon the debtors of a community, by a contraction of the currency arising from a diminution in the quantity of legal money—His situation would be very different, however, if during the same period the value of labor had increased, owing to a fall in the value of money, caused by its having been doubled in quantity. In this case, the house which was originally worth one thousand dollars, but which under adverse circumstances might be sold for only five hundred dollars, would be worth two thousand dollars; and the products of labor, other than money, which the owner of that house had received in exchange for his one thousand contracts for one dollar each, would also sell

for two thousand dollars; so that after he had redeemed his contracts, he would be in possession of wealth, which, if measured by the standard of money, would be worth three thousand dollars.

Your committee will not attempt to make any estimate of the amount of contracts, at any time, existing in the United States constituting its currency. That portion however of our currency which consists of contracts to pay money on demand, whether issued by individuals or corporate bodies, such as bank notes, and which properly constitutes the *circulating medium* of the country, may be estimated with tolerable precision, by ascertaining the quantity of coined money in the country, and then computing this description of notes as four times greater in amount—for this calculation is more than justified by the general statements of the most cautiously conducted banks, exclusive of deposits and bank credits. An estimate thus made will be sufficiently accurate to settle principles—and, if it be admitted that, six months ago, there were thirty millions of metalic dollars in the country, there was then, according to the above rule for computing the same, a circulating medium of bank notes, payable on demand, amounting to about one hundred and twenty millions of dollars—which being used as money, by *courtesy*, in the interchange of wealth, caused the products of labor to be then estimated by this standard. But if the amount of metalic dollars has since been diminished to twenty millions, by exportation, to pay a balance of trade against this country, which may be stated as a fact of recent occurrence, the quantity of notes payable on demand, or circulating medium, must have been diminished to eighty millions of dollars—and if the amount shall not be speedily augmented, the value of the products of labor must be adjusted by this standard.

Again, let it be supposed that the wealth of the country was twenty-four hundred millions of dollars on the first day of June last, measured by the then currency—now, it would be worth but sixteen hundred millions of dollars, as measured by the considerations in contracts constituting the present currency of the country—which shows a loss of eight hundred millions of dollars by this standard, that is primarily referrible to the abstraction of only ten millions of money, to liquidate a balance of trade with foreign countries, created by excessive importations of the products of foreign labor, which could have been better supplied by our own industry, as far as our necessities required them.

How many men of wealth have been reduced to poverty by this unfavorable balance of trade—How many children will remain uneducated by reason of the adversity it has occasioned—and how many fathers will be required to labor twelve hours in the day to earn the same amount of money, that, six months ago, they could have earned in eight hours, can only be answered by the records of courts and the registers of asylums for the poor.

The committee would, however, do injustice to themselves, if they did not declare it to be their settled conviction, that gold and silver are the only safe commodities of which to constitute money; and they are persuaded that they are supported in this opinion by the great mass of the American people, that to abandon the principle of making these the basis of contracts, would break up the foundations of society and disorganise all our civil institutions. Yet they are equally bound to declare their conviction, that there can be no security that this basis of our currency can be maintained, unless the power of congress to regulate commerce shall be

so exercised, as to prevent the introduction of the products of foreign labor into our country, for which our surplus labor will not pay, when sold in foreign markets—a regulation, that can alone prevent such a balance of trade accruing against us as would withdraw the foundations on which our contracts rest.

A guide to national prosperity and safety more true and unerring cannot be found than a favorable balance of trade, sustained by such a regulation of commerce; nor one more fallacious, than that furnished by a tariff graduated by the mere calls of the government treasury, to defray ordinary or current expenses. A treasury, made to overflow by imposts on foreign goods, is but an evidence of great importations of the product of foreign labor; and shows clearly, that great exportations of the product of our labor must follow, to balance the purchases made in foreign countries; whilst it warns us that, if all other descriptions of the products of our labor are insufficient for this object, our money must disappear.

If an ample security against this state of things can only be obtained by a tariff of protecting duties, and these produce a surplus revenue, would it not be better to appropriate this surplus to *any* national object, rather than to pursue a different course, that must paralise the industry of the people? Certainly, it would be better so to dispose of a surplus, thus created, than to permit the general wealth of the country to be diminished some hundreds of millions of dollars, when measured either by the standard of labor, or by contracts existing for the payment of money. Far better would it comport with the interest of the nation, to regulate commerce in such a way as shall increase our currency, by increasing the means of its redemption, to an extent, that a day's labor will produce so much more wealth here, than it will elsewhere, that emigration will flow to us from all parts of the civilized world, to assist in subduing our boundless forests, and render our waste lands, which are now tenanted by wild beasts, tributary to the happiness of the human family.

The events that preceded the late war furnish a lesson which ought always to be held in remembrance. Between the time when the embargo was laid in the year 1807, and the time that it was raised in the year 1809, the importation of foreign goods was permitted, and exchange on England rose in the U. States, 9 per cent. above par, payable in the currency of England, which was then 10 per cent. below metalic money. But after the embargo was raised and the non-importation act substituted, our exports became so large and our importations were so small—those from England being prohibited, that exchange on London fell, in 1811, in the U. States, 20 per cent. below par, and coin flowed into the country from every quarter: then the currency expanded to a degree that induced improvements in the soil, in manufactures and houses, to an extent that had never before been equalled. Let it also be remembered, that, when war was declared, and exportation nearly ceased, the precious metals left us with as great rapidity as they had previously sought our shores; and continued to do so, until contracts could no longer be satisfied in money; until the government itself could not comply with its engagements—in fact, until it could not even pay the interest of its debt in money. If it be asked why could it not comply with its engagements to pay money?—it may be answered, for the plain reason that money is an article of commerce, and, as such, had left the country to pay debts, which other products of labor could not be exported to discharge. The embargo of 1807 was a regulation of commerce that

depressed the value of labor, and the non-importation act of 1811 was a regulation of commerce which augmented the value of labor. The one, suppressed our whole exports—the other, a part of our imports. The war too of 1812 destroyed our entire commerce with the enemy—yet it was declared and prosecuted to protect our foreign trade, and thereby to promote the general welfare. Assuredly, these positions will be admitted by the strongest advocates of free trade. And is not congress still charged with the duty of promoting the general welfare? Or, by what means can this be more effectually done, than by regulations of commerce that will promote the industry of our own citizens—enable them to comply with their contracts to pay gold and silver, when they have contracted to pay money, and also to use and expand the resources which a bountiful Providence has placed so abundantly within their control; and thus diffuse the greatest possible degree of benefit and happiness through the whole body of the people?

It is not contended that the trite remark, "that trade will regulate itself," is not in the abstract true; nor that money, will not, like all other articles of commerce, seek the best market: but admitting these axioms to be true—how are these ends accomplished?—Sometimes trade will regulate itself by means that must bring ruin upon a whole nation. It may regulate itself by permitting products of labor to be imported from countries where a day's labor can be obtained for twenty cents—where the laborer is but half fed and half clothed: and these products may be imported to an extent that would draw from our country such a proportion of our money, as would enable the possessors of that which remains to purchase a day's labor for eighteen cents. Then, and not till then, would money come, by the ordinary laws of trade, to us, in payment for the products of our labor; because these would then be cheaper here than elsewhere.

Though the committee entertain no doubt but that the maintenance of a balance of trade in favor of the country, is not only essential but absolutely necessary to preserve a general advancement in prosperity and wealth, in which each member of the community is interested, be he rich or poor, be he a possessor of houses or lands, of manufactories or mechanic arts; or be he the possessor of the elements by which wealth is acquired in any other way—all are interested in their respective degrees, according to their stake in the common family. But while the committee wish to express in the most unequivocal way their opinion upon this point, they must not be understood as advocating an exercise of the power of congress in the regulation of commerce, that will keep this balance of trade in favor of the country beyond the extent of a decided but moderate amount, which will augment the quantity of gold and silver brought into the country, and retain it in about the proportions that the population will increase in number.

The committee suppose it will be admitted, that stability in the value of all products of labor would be a desideratum in political economy, more desirable than any other; but that this is altogether unattainable, as long as diversity of soil and climate exists—causes producing effects against which the wisest legislation cannot effectually provide. As for instance, what would be the effect upon our country if an unseasonable frost in the month of June or July, should destroy our grain crops, by which the community would have to purchase their bread in foreign coun-

tries for one year—or, if by the same means in the months of August or September, the cotton and tobacco crops should be destroyed and their value as exports be lost to the country? A balance of trade would be immediately created, which could drain the legal money from the country, to an extent that would either suspend the laws enacted to enforce the fulfilment of contracts, or would pass all the property of the debtors of the country into the hands of their creditors, for nominal considerations, at forced sales.

But these are contingencies which no legislation can guard against, more than it can against war, pestilence, or other means used by the great first cause to arouse men to a reliance upon him for all their blessings—while the same evils, brought upon other nations, which would render a reliance upon us exclusively for the necessaries of life, at our own prices, would bring to our country gold and silver in such quantities, as would augment the value of the products of labor here, when measured by this standard, so high, that no tariff of duties or any thing short of total prohibition, would prevent the products of the labor of countries thus impoverished, from being brought to us, with which to draw back our surplus treasure.

If then it be impracticable by any regulation of commerce, to produce stability in the value of labor; and stability, if attainable, would conduce to the general prosperity, it would seem clear that the nearest approximation to this point which can be attained, ought to be sought in all legal restraints upon commerce.

Nor must the committee be understood as advocating a general system of high duties, unless such duties be indispensable to produce, under ordinary circumstances, a balance of trade in favor of the country—that system of duties which shall operate as a positive and ample protection to our own industry, in developing to the greatest extent the elements which we possess within ourselves to supply in the greatest measure possible our own wants, and add to our own security, must be the most judicious system which can be devised in any regulations of commerce, intended to promote the general welfare—and this may possibly leave exempt from duty, altogether, many products of the labor of foreign countries, which are either necessary to combine with our elements in developing our own resources and augmenting our wealth, or which are necessary to add to our comfort, happiness or national protection and defence.

In conformity with the views of the committee, all contracts for the payment of money, which in their nature are transferable, either by assignment or by delivery, are currency, and as such, pass for just as much as they will sell for, in the market: yet all currency is not "circulating medium."

Circulating medium consists exclusively of that portion of the currency which approximates in value so near to gold and silver, that, by common consent, it is, in the ordinary transactions of society, accepted and used as money, at its nominal value—But the moment currency ceases to pass at its full nominal value, it assumes the character of any other article of commerce, and ought to pass for only as much as it will command in money. If it pass for more than it will sell for in money, the party who has issued the contract, if he has received a full consideration for it, gains the difference between the nominal and actual value at the expense of the public, if it be that description of currency which enters into the transactions of

society as circulating medium or a substitute for money. The principle is the same, whether its value be one per cent. or ten per cent. below par: it ceases to be "circulating medium" equal in value to legal money. It is a depreciated circulating medium, and the circulating medium which existed in the United States during the late war, is an illustration showing how far such a medium may be permitted to depreciate, when the operation of laws for enforcing the obligation of contracts shall be suspended, either by common consent or from necessity, as was the case then, and will for the same reasons be the case again, if the country shall become involved in a war with a nation sufficiently powerful to prevent the exportation of all other products of labor except gold and silver, because the immutable principles upon which the laws of trade are founded, cannot be controuled by municipal regulations—If the stock of gold and silver on hand at the commencement of the war shall be drawn off and exhausted, contracts payable in these materials cannot be fulfilled—yet the ordinary intercourse of society requires a "circulating medium," and if this medium be formed of contracts to pay gold and silver, they are contracts to perform impossibilities—they cannot be paid in that which cannot be obtained—Under such circumstances, if the operation of law be not suspended either by common consent or otherwise, a general bankruptcy of debtors must take place, including not only individuals but corporations, and especially banks, as their notes payable on demand would first come under the provisions of law, and be first rendered liable to its operation—No bank, whatever its powers might be, under ordinary circumstances, could maintain specie payments, and continue to prosecute business and issue notes payable on demand, if gold and silver be exported and cannot be imported.—For such contingencies an exercise of sovereign power is necessary, which would be highly inexpedient, if not illegal, under other circumstances.

As the portion of our currency that, from the facility with which it is convertible into legal money, is by courtesy used as money, and constitutes the circulating medium; and as this medium consists principally of bank notes, it may not be improper for the committee to present their views in relation not only to banks, but the effect which they have upon the industry and prosperity of the community; for the purpose of dispelling an opinion, too often entertained, that they possess a controling power, at all times, over the property and wealth of a nation—and exercise that power, by making money plenty or scarce, at their pleasure.

Banks are nothing more than associations of individuals, who have joined their funds together in one common stock, to be employed by the agents of the proprietors, in the purchase of that portion of the currency which consists of bonds, bills and notes of other companies or individuals—and which are mere contracts to pay money, at some future time or place: and such purchases are made by them, upon the same principles that govern individuals or other companies, that are formed for different commercial objects.

In the United States, these companies, generally, are incorporated by laws, under which the corporators surrender some of their natural and undeniable rights for the purpose of procuring a legal exemption, for each individual stockholder, from liability to a greater extent, on account of the acts of his copartners, than the amount of funds he has placed in the joint capital; and for the purpose also, of obtaining in law, the character and benefits of individuality in conducting proceedings in courts of justice. The pub-

lic security is not perhaps so great in such companies, as it would be if they were not incorporated—for, without an act of incorporation, each copartner would be liable for all the debts of his company, to the extent of his whole estate. These banking companies however, have become very numerous, under the sanction of law; and they are all employed in buying or discounting currency that is payable at some future time; and giving for this currency their own notes, payable at sight or on demand. The quality of the currency brought to them for sale or discount, is judged of by them, according to the same rules that govern purchasers of any other article. That which they consider good is accepted, and that which is doubtful they reject. Contracts made by persons who are supposed to possess such an abundance of wealth, that, if it were brought to sale, even under the operation of law, would purchase as much legal money as would redeem all their contracts, are considered fair articles of commerce with a bank; articles, which it will purchase, and on such terms as the parties can agree upon, if bills of exchange; but if they are promissory notes, then the purchasers cannot legally buy them at a lower rate, in some of the United States, than six per cent. per annum, deducted from the nominal amount of such notes or bonds, without subjecting the purchasers to the operation of penal laws.

It has been supposed by persons well informed upon the subject, that there are in the United States about three hundred and thirty banks, in which capital has been vested to the amount of one hundred and forty-five millions of dollars. If this estimate be correct, it will follow that there must be now in the United States as many millions of dollars—provided however, that the capital of those banks was all paid in gold and silver and still remained in their vaults: but a supposition so preposterous as this will not be entertained by any one. For, in the first place, bank capital never was all paid in gold and silver, with the exception perhaps of the first bank which was established in this country: and *secondly*, if it had so been and were still in bank, it would have been wholly useless to the owners. Whatever legal money was paid in to constitute the capitals of our banks, has not only all been paid out for the contracts of individuals, based upon the products of labor, owned and possessed by those individuals—but the banks themselves have, in addition thereto, issued their own notes to an amount varying perhaps from one hundred and twenty millions of dollars down to sixty or eighty millions of dollars. It will thus appear that, if the bank capitals amount to one hundred and forty five millions of dollars and they have issued their own notes to the amount of one hundred millions, which, in addition to their capitals, are invested in individual contracts or general currency—the banks have the power to call upon the community for two hundred and forty-five millions of dollars; or one hundred and forty-five millions more than the community can demand from them. If, therefore, the banks were to decline purchasing currency, and that which they held would all fall due in equal proportions daily throughout one year, their calls upon the debtors in the community would be, daily, for the payment of about four hundred thousand dollars; but if it would all fall due within six months, which is perhaps nearer the time limited for its payment, their average daily calls, for legal money, would be at the rate of eight hundred thousand dollars.—These demands could not be paid; the money could not be obtained by their debtors—because there is not, and probably never has been, more than one fifth part of this gross sum of money in the United States, at any one time. Nevertheless, should

the operations of law bring to sale, for such prices as it would command, a sufficient quantity of the property of debtors to liquidate these claims, it must be self-evident that it could not sell for more money than the country contained; indeed, that it would sell for just as much below that sum as the possessors of the money might choose to receive it at—unless, money should be brought or sent by its owners from foreign countries to exchange for the products of labor here, by reason of these being so much lower in this country than elsewhere as to hold out a sufficient inducement to foreigners to emigrate to the United States—or make purchases therein.

It is evident, therefore, that a combination of a few banks could monopolise, for a time, the whole legal money in the United States, and thereby temporarily reduce the value of the products of labor to any standard they might desire. But though the power to monopolise all the legal money of the United States may exist in the hands of comparatively a few stockholders in banks, it may still be presumed that no danger will emanate from this source; because, *firstly* of the difficulty of forming such combinations, and *secondly* of the restraint imposed by the moral sense of those who are charged with the administration of such corporate bodies. It must be admitted, however, that the security of the community against the effects of a partial or total monopoly of the money of the country, results more from the number of banks, and the competition which exists amongst them in trade—than from any restraint imposed upon them by law, or the probability that the balance of trade will bring into the country an amount of money so large that it would be impossible, or too difficult, for the banks to make a monopoly of it. Still it cannot be denied, that, wherever the power exists to abstract from the community the coin or legal money that is possessed by it, and upon which contracts based upon the products of labor have been adjusted, there the power must also be to regulate the value of all other products of labor in the possession of the community—whilst the sacred obligation to fulfil contracts, in the spirit and according to the policy of our social system, shall be maintained—and the parties possessing this power may be either creditors, living in foreign countries, or individuals and corporations in our own.

The committee consider banks, whether incorporated or un-incorporated, as not differing from other private companies, whose operations are confined to a particular branch of commerce; and bank notes as not differing in any degree, either in their nature or in their effects upon society, from the notes of any other corporations, companies or individuals, whose ability and will to comply with their engagements, are unquestionable. It has been remarked too, that it is their business to trade in the currency of the country, and that the currency of the country rests for its value upon the amount of wealth in the hands of debtors, who are the parties that have issued the currency; and that, the banks themselves have, as debtors, issued from sixty to eighty or one hundred millions of dollars of that portion of the currency, which is the most speedily available in obtaining money; and that after they shall have paid the amount of their debts, they can call upon the community for the production of one hundred and forty-five millions more, at such times as their discretion might dictate. It this appears, that the power which the banks possess over the wealth of the country results from the fact, that the amount of specie therein is much less than the amount of bank capital, and that the chief secu-

rity which we have against an injurious exercise of that power for the benefit of their stockholders, is to be found in the moral sense and patriotism of bank directors.

It is now proper to shew that it is not in the power of banks to relieve the community from a pressure for money, when a balance of trade exists against the country, however desirous the directors of banks may be to do so. These institutions are the principal depositories of the gold and silver of our country—and their notes form a circulating medium, payable on demand. Any person who can possess himself, be he a foreigner or citizen, of these notes, can therefore, at a moment's notice, demand that the vaults of the banks at which they are payable shall be unlocked, and their coin paid out, to be put on ship-board for exportation. Few banks, if any, in this country have more than one half as much coin, at any time, in their vaults, as they have notes in circulation. They are, therefore, liable at all times to be called upon for more money than they possess. The security they feel that this will not be the case, springs from the expectation that the coin will not be wanted; or, if wanted, from a knowledge that their notes are scattered and distributed into the hands of so many persons, that they cannot be collected and brought in for payment except in small quantities, and during many days, and, that while this operation is going on, they can collect as great an amount of money from their debtors as will be drawn from the banks in coin; provided, they purchase no more currency and do not re-issue their own notes. Banks, it thus appears, must first feel the pressure of a call for money to pay a balance of trade due in a foreign place; and they, in turn, produce, not from choice, but from necessity, a corresponding pressure upon the debtors of the country; and these, under such circumstances, resort to a sale of the wealth they possess, in the shape of products of labor or articles of commerce, to procure money, with which to redeem the currency they have issued and which is held by the banks. At such times, legal money, or gold and silver, will be more in demand than any other articles—and such demand will become more urgent and pressing in proportion as the quantity of money diminishes; until, by the ordinary operation of the course of trade, which adjusts prices by demand and supply, the value of gold and silver is raised so high, when compared with other descriptions of wealth or products of labor, that these will here sink so low, when compared with the products of labor elsewhere, that gold and silver will come to us, to purchase labor or its product; because it can be purchased here, with gold and silver, cheaper than in other countries. When this state of things takes place, the balance of trade will be in our favor, and remain so, until as much gold and silver shall come to us as will, when measured by that standard, raise the value of labor higher here than in other places, when the tide will again turn.

But as every turn of the commercial wheel which produces an unfavorable balance of trade, is attended by devastation and ruin to the debtors of a community, who always constitute the great body of the people in all commercial nations; and as great portions of the property of these must pass, at such times, into the hands of creditors, either domestic or foreign, for little more than nominal considerations, given at forced sales—the rich then become more rich, but all others suffer; a paralysis takes place in commerce; the relations of society are disturbed—and, as the whole economy of the nation has to be re-organised, a new generation must arise before general prosperity can again pervade the land. To guard against such

catastrophies in the United States, it would seem that the power to regulate commerce was wisely and necessarily bestowed on congress.

Finally, your committee wish to be understood as being of the opinion, that the powers and operations of banks upon the wealth and prosperity of the nation, when their powers are used with sound discretion and in good faith, are highly salutary; provided their capitals, be moderate in amount—and a fair competition in their trade is maintained.

If incorporated banks did not exist, unincorporated banks would undoubtedly be established; and individuals would here perform all the functions of banks—as they do in England, by dealing in the currency, and issuing notes which would constitute a circulating medium. For if they did not, the same system of barter would, from necessity, have to be adopted in the interchange of commodities of value that exists in some other nations; and this could only be done by our being in possession of so much of the precious metals that an exchange of the product of one day's labor in silver or gold could always be made directly for any other product of labor, of equal amount or value—and into which an equal quantity of labor had entered. A state of things under which commercial prosperity could never be experienced, because the cost and value of the capital employed must always be equal in amount to that for which it would be exchanged; and hence no profit could accrue to either the buyer or seller, except what would arise from any difference in the value of the articles exchanged, that might happen from subsequent alterations between the demand and supply.

It will be perceived that the committee have confined their remarks upon the effects of the balance of trade, to the commerce of this with foreign nations. They have so done because it is this balance, alone, which operates upon the whole mass of the people of the United States. But balances of trade also exist between different portions of our own country, and between individuals of the same vicinity—as is evident from the prosperity of certain towns and districts and decline of others; and from the prosperity of some individuals and adversity of others. These are matters which may however, be safely left to regulate themselves, under our happy constitution—which guarantees a free trade between the several states of our union—and to the influence of our equally wise laws, which, by destroying the right of primogeniture, have caused the wealth of this country to be diffused in as many hands as possible Under such circumstances, the enterprise of our fellow citizens will regulate our home trade better than any regulations of the states respectively, could govern it. The people of this union are one commercial community—and, whilst the purchases and sales made by its members are made exclusively amongst themselves, this community cannot over-trade itself—for all its wealth will remain in the possession of some of its members, should it change hands every day: and to the community, as such, it will be immaterial whether it were chiefly in the hands of A and B, or C and D; as A, B, C and D, would have the whole of it.

This committee would certainly fail if they attempted to shew that any system can be provided, in relation to our general currency, that would be more advantageous to the community, or perfect and simple in its operation, or one, which is better calculated to afford every attainable facility in the interchange of wealth, and at the same time be so free from all tendency to vitiate the public morals, than that which now exists—Based upon the product of labor, and relying upon the integrity of the laws of the states, for the certainty with which the fulfilment of con-

tracts can be enforced—we regard it as a system commended to our approbation, not less by experience than by sound reason. But, let it be also remembered, that not only the stability of the system, but likewise its utility to the public, depends upon the power of congress to regulate commerce, being exercised in such way as will protect the industry of our citizens to an extent that shall, at all times, maintain a balance of trade in favor of our country; which is the only means by which gold and silver can be retained, or contracts payable in these commodities be fulfilled—or those ruinous depressions prevented in the value of property, which always bring distress and adversity upon the most enterprising portion of our citizens.

The committee feel that some apology is necessary for the length of this report, notwithstanding that they have perhaps sacrificed clearness to their desire to reduce the subject within a moderate limit; still they hope it will be acknowledged, that the importance of the question will furnish a justification, for the indispensable details into which they have been led.

All which is respectfully submitted,

THOMAS ELLICOTT, *Chairman.*

REPORT ON SUGAR AND MOLASSES.

Mr. *D. W. Coxe*, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of the committee to which was referred the subject of the production, manufacture and consumption of sugar and molasses in the United States, made the following

REPORT:

That, like other manufactures of the United States, those of the south claim the support and protection of the general government. Although sugar and molasses do not come within the ordinary acceptation of the term, yet they are, in reality, like the fabric of cotton, derived from the produce of the soil, and that too by a most laborious, delicate and expensive process. Sugar, moreover, has become by long habit a necessary, and not a luxury of life in this country, where it forms an indispensable part of two of the daily meals of its most indigent inhabitants. The policy, therefore, of securing a cheap and certain supply of so important a comfort to every family, cannot be denied. In examining the subject of the protection of sugar and molasses, your committee assume as an incontrovertible maxim, advanced in the celebrated report on manufactures by Alexander Hamilton, that, in all cases, where a country possesses an ample supply of any raw material, full and entire protection, against rival foreign articles made from that material, will in time invariably reduce price, by home competition, to the lowest rate at which they can be afforded; to which may be added, that the examples of Great Britain and France fully confirm the truth of this axiom in relation to all their staple manufactures. Conclusive proof, however, is found in the experience of our own country upon this point, and the following apposite cases may be adduced. Coarse cotton cloths now sell for 6 to 7 cents the yard, the protective duty is $8\frac{3}{4}$ cents the square yard. They were formerly worth 20 to 25 cents. Protection, therefore, has brought the price below the duty. Lead is now at $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. in Missouri—the duty is 3 cents. It was formerly worth 6 to 8 cents. Common window-glass is now 4 to $4\frac{1}{2}$ dollars the box—duty $3\frac{1}{2}$ dollars per 100 feet—it formerly sold at 10 to 14 dollars. Cut nails now 6 cents per lb.—duty 5 cents—formerly worth 10 to 12 cents. Copperas is now worth $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents—duty is 2 cents—before the late war it was 3 cents, but rose, during the war, to 20 cents. The same remark applies to various manufactures of leather, to coarse hats, to all cabinet and other wares of wood, to carriages, to the coal of Pennsylvania and other states, which bids fair to rival the fisheries and coasting trade in the employment of shipping, and as a nursery for seamen. Seven hundred sail of sloops and schooners were loaded at Philadelphia alone the last year with this article. To these, among many others, may be added sugar and molasses. The aggregate quantity of the

former consumed annually in the United States is estimated at about 150 millions of pounds weight, and already do we make, under the influence of the duty of 3 cents per lb. imposed in 1816, 100 millions of pounds, equal to two-thirds of the whole consumption of the country, which is now worth in Louisiana 5 cents per lb. The duty, as before stated, is 3 cents, and the former price, for many years, varied from 8 to 12 cents. Refined loaf sugar, manufactured from domestic and foreign brown sugar, is largely consumed at home, and beginning to be extensively exported. It contributes, consequently, to increase the demand for, and cultivation of, the former.

It is worthy of special observation, that Great Britain protects her colonial brown sugars by a duty of 12½ cents per lb. on the *foreign* article; France her's by a duty of 9 cents; while the United States are deemed by the modern economists very unreasonable for imposing only 3 cents for the same purpose. The consequence, however, of the *British policy* is, that she supplies nearly *all the world* with her *refined* loaf sugar, excepting only France and Russia, who, it is believed, prohibit the introduction of foreign loaf sugar altogether. The United States ought to become the greatest sugar refining country, as they possess within their metropolitan limits an extensive sugar region, and allow, moreover, a drawback of 5 cents per lb. on their loaf sugar exported to foreign countries. Thus, the continuance of the 3 cent duty must ere long secure to this country a large share of the refining business.*

Of molasses, the quantity made, at the rate of 60 gallons for every 1,000 lbs. of sugar, is from 90 to 100,000 casks, of 60 gallons each, worth 14 to 16 cents per gallon, and of a quality very superior to any imported. This article was protected by the tariff of 1828 by a duty of 10 cents per gallon, but it was last year reduced to 5 cents, which is sufficient. Should the duties, however, on these two articles be now reduced, the consequence must, in the opinion of your committee, be most disastrous to the planters of the south, in which may be included the infant establishments of Georgia and Florida. The number of sugar plantations, large and small, in Louisiana alone, exceeds, from the best information, 500, half of which are supposed to be worked by steam, the remainder by cattle and horses.

Of the vast amount of capital employed in buildings, lands, slaves, steam engines, and other machinery, iron boilers, cattle, horses and implements of husbandry, clothing, the purchase of slaves, every thing except bricks, wood and mortar, are supplied from the other states, including those bordering on the Ohio and its tributary waters; to which may be added, the annual demand for corn, flour, staves, hoops, beef, pork, bacon and lard, required for the use of these estates, which, if ruined by a reduction of even one cent per lb. of the duty of foreign sugar, must cease to consume them,

* In New Orleans there are 3 sugar refineries,

Baltimore	4
Philadelphia	11
New York	11
Providence, R. I.	1
Boston	3
Salem, M.	1
Total,	34

P. S. There are *eight* refineries in Baltimore. H. N.

and thereby seriously injure those who depend on Louisiana for a vent for those articles, while the United States, deprived of her sugar culture, will again be at the mercy of the foreign sugar growers, who would then recover and hold a monopoly of the supply, and be enabled to dictate prices, as Great Britain assuredly would do, were the cotton, woollen and iron manufactures of this country overwhelmed by a similar impolitic reduction of the protecting duties; presenting a practical illustration of free trade doctrine, which sanctions the admission of foreign rival commodities without duty, and does not object to the exclusion of our own from the ports of that rival, or deem it a grievance requiring correction. Another infallible consequence of a repeal or reduction of the duty, would be again to force the whole of the sugar country into the cultivation of cotton, whereby 100,000 additional bales of cotton would be brought annually into the market, and thereby tend to augment the evil effects of over production. These are not all the disadvantages that would be experienced from even a partial repeal of the duty on sugar, at this crisis of depression in prices. The coasting trade of the country would be seriously affected: 100,000 tons of shipping and steamboats, now annually required to transport the sugar and molasses of Louisiana to the northern and western states, would be thrown out of employ. In fine, the strong tie of interest and dependency of one pursuit of industry on its correlative branch for employment, now existing between the sugar planters and those whose wants they supply, and by whom they also are supplied in return, would be rent asunder and dissolved, and our former condition of a reliance on foreign supplies, and a precarious foreign vent for the articles now consumed by the sugar growers of Louisiana, would naturally return.

There is yet a remaining consideration connected with this interesting subject, which your committee feel they ought not to omit to notice. The enterprising spirit of our southern brethren has, within a few years past, stimulated them to such extraordinary exertions in opening new sugar plantations and extending the old ones, that their pecuniary engagements and debts, contracted on the faith of a continuance of the present protection, have been greatly augmented in expectation of ultimate remuneration; and it is a lamentable truth, that the sugar planters of Louisiana are at this moment indebted to the extent probably of one-third of the value of their entire estates and slaves, and are paying an interest of 5 to 10 per cent. on loans that can only be extinguished from the avails of their future crops. Meanwhile these bold and adventurous undertakings are producing for the community at large the most beneficial results, and bid fair, by the reclaiming and draining of the rich alluvial lands of Louisiana, (*formerly* deemed of no value) to spread the cultivation of the cane over all that country, so as, in a few years, not only to place beyond all contingencies the future supply of the United States, but to add a new and important item to the list of exports. Believing, moreover, that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the price of domestic sugar has been reduced by protection, to the advantage of all, especially the poorer classes, your committee feel satisfied in expressing their decided opinion, that sound policy requires the present duty on foreign sugar should be allowed to remain undisturbed.

Appendix to the Report on Sugar and Molasses.

The Permanent Committee of the New York Convention believe that many useful remarks and facts may be added to the report of the special committee, to whom the subject of the production, manufacture and consumption of sugar and molasses was referred—to shew the intimate and important connection of this branch of industry with others, and its general and powerful tendency to enlarge the internal trade of our country, and increase the common stock of national wealth. Certain facts collected by the planters of Louisiana, with the statements made by Mr. Johnston, one of the senators from that state in congress, and many other valuable papers are before us—of which we propose to offer a condensed view, and apply the *data* obtained to bring out probable aggregates.

At the time of the cession of Louisiana (1803) there was a revenue duty of 2½ cents per lb. on sugar. The great influx of capital and enterprise which followed the cession, caused a much increased application of labor to the cultivation of the cane. For many years, the experiment seemed a doubtful one; but the cane gradually adapted itself to the climate, and rendered the crop more certain, though still a precarious one—skill, also, was acquired by experience, and scientific power brought into use; and, in about twenty years after the cession, the product amounted to 40,000 hogsheads per annum, and began to afford a profit on the large capital that had been employed in this business. In 1816, an additional half cent per lb. was added to the duty, to protect the cultivation; and, from that time, confidence in ultimate success being entertained, capital was freely vested in lands and slaves for the manufacture of sugar; and the present result is, a yearly product of about 100,000,000 lbs. of sugar and 5,000,000 gallons of molasses, worth about six millions of dollars: of which amount at least four millions are annually paid by the planters to the people of *other* states, for provisions, manufactures and labor supplied.

Speaking with reference to the foreign demand for the agricultural productions of the United States, Mr. Johnston, in his letter to the secretary of the treasury of the 31st December 1830, says—

'It is very doubtful whether it is possible, from any increase of agricultural products, to increase the value of the export. It will be seen, then, what proportion this will bear to the whole export, what amount of labor it will divert, and what interchanges it will create.

I refer you to the answer of the Central Committee of Louisiana, in which they present you the result of the operation of 20 plantations for five years, in the parish of Plaquemine, and in the most favorable position.

The capital of 20 plantations	$2,028,000	
Gross revenue	274,818	80
Per cent. per annum	13	55
Expenses	171,650	
For the furnishers of objects consumed—per cent.	8	46
For the planters—per cent.	5	09
Total, equal to (gross revenue)	13	55
Cost to the planter, (expenses) 3.63 per lb.		
profit on capital 1.87 per lb. 5.50		

It may be, therefore, safely assumed that the actual cost, independent of the slaves and land, and fixtures, is not less than 3½ cents a pound, and the profit not more than 2 cents.

Of the 100,000 hogsheads estimated at	$5,500,000	
And 5,000,000 of gallons of molasses	1,000,000	
	6,500,000	
Actual expense, (at 3½ cents)	4,136,363	63
Profit, (2 cents)	2,363,636	37
	$6,500,000	00

"It is extremely difficult to estimate the profit upon capital: the value of property which constitutes the capital, depends, in general, upon the interest it produces. There is loss of time and capital in making the establishment. The first four years will probably yield no actual profit, but the labor is employed in making valuable improvements, which add to the value of the estate and become capital. Besides, when in the most successful operation, the crop depends upon the seasons, and somewhat upon the soil, state of preparation, skill, and other causes. Thus a plantation with 99 slaves yielded--

In 1825	250 hhds.
1826	350
1827	600
1828	550
1829	174
	5)1,924
General average	384 4-5

Which is less than 4 hhds. to the hand.

"This is an established plantation in successful operation: and the result greatly exceeds the other plantations in the neighborhood. This crop is made by 67 working hands. In some favorable seasons, as '27-'28, they made eight or nine hogsheads to the hand; and in others from 2 2-3 to 3. When one of these favorable seasons occurs, and an extraordinary crop is produced, it becomes a matter of great notoriety, is published in the papers, and thus the impression is made that the profit is immense, that the duty is unnecessarily high, and ought to be repealed or reduced. Under this false view of the subject, it has been brought before congress, and many members have meditated the reduction of two cents a pound, equal to the whole profit upon the labor. I cannot believe that the southern states, with a correct view of this great concern, will consent to destroy this national object; one essential to our independence and our comfort; to destroy the whole value of slave property; to ruin the people of Louisiana, now in a course of experiment; to strike out from the protection of government the only great object in which the south can feel any interest; an object which will be a full equivalent for all the south pays under the tariff system."

The twenty plantations, on an average for five years, yielded 4,379 hhds. of sugar or 4,379,000 lbs. and employed 1,086 working hands, requiring, in all 1,674 slaves. The whole product of sugar being taken at 100 millions of pounds— the following results appear:

As 4,379 hhds. are to 2,028,000 dollars, so are 100,000 hhds. to 46,300,000 dollars, the whole capital vested in the sugar estates of Louisiana.

And—as 4,379 hhds. are to 1,674 slaves, so are 100,000 to 38,200 slaves, the aggregate required on the present sugar plantations.

The following extract from the appendix to the same letter of Mr. Johnston is highly interesting—

The capital invested in a plantation capable of producing, by the best management, 400,000 pounds of sugar, and 10,000 gallons of molasses, worth on the plantation 23,000 dollars, must consist as follows:

1,500 acres of land, at $50 per acre	75,000
90 hands, at 600 dollars each	54,000
40 pair of working oxen, at 50 dollars	2,000
40 horses, at 100 dollars	4,000
Horizontal sugar mill	4,000
2 sets of boilers, at 1500 dollars each	3,000
Buildings of all descriptions	25,000
12 carts	1,200
30 ploughs	300
All other utensils, such as timber wheels, hoes, spades, axes, scythes, &c.	1,500
	170,000

The annual expenses on the above plantation, cost 10,700 dollars in the following items:

Provisions of all kinds	3,500
Clothing of all sorts,	1,500
Medical attendance and medicine	500
Annual losses in negroes	1,500
Taxes	500
Horses and oxen	1,200
Repairs of buildings	700
Ploughs, carts, &c.	300
Overseer	1,000
	*$10,700

Two crops of cane are generally made in succession on the same land, one of plant cane, the other of the second year's growth; it then lies fallow two years or is planted in corn and beans.

Gross proceeds	$23,000
Expenses	10,000
Net proceeds	12,300

Being about 7 per cent. on the capital invested.

The preceding facts, subject to the rule adopted above, might be used to bring out many important results. We shall only take one—the amount of provisions annually purchased by the sugar planters.

As 400 hhds. of sugar are to 3,500 dollars paid for provisions, so are 100,000 hhds. to 875,000 dollars, annually paid for pork, corn, and other supplies, chiefly furnished by Kentucky, Ohio, &c. and it should be observed that the supplies of clothing, mills, boilers, carts, ploughs, and other utensils, and of *horses* and *oxen*, as well as of slaves, are all derived from other states of the union. We say all—for the foreign products or manufactures which enter into the consumption of the Louisiana sugar planters, are of small importance or value.

The statement just given has reference to one of the best managed estates in Louisiana. With sugar at 5 cents per lb. on the plantation, its late price, it is stated that the capital employed does not yield 6 per cent. per annum.

The present consumption of sugar in the United States may be put down at 150 millions of pounds—one-third of which is imported. In 1840 it is estimated that 200,000 hogsheads of home made sugar will be required, employing or subsisting about 75,000 slaves, and go on to increase, if the production be protected. Mr. Johnston says that Louisiana, alone, can supply the whole demand for sugar in the United States for 25 years to come. But there are large tracts of land fitted for the cultivation in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and Florida—especially the latter.

In 1829 there were 725 sugar plantations in Louisiana, and we have seen it mentioned that they have increased to more than 800. Many of them, however, are small estates, or not yet producing much sugar, It requires four or five years to bring them into a state of profitable production.

If all the sugar and molasses consumed in the United States were of foreign product, nearly 10 millions of dollars would be required to pay for these commodi-

* It should be observed, that only 2,000 dollars, of the 10,700 expended, can be brought into those classes of articles on which duties are payable—to wit, for clothing and medicine, being less than *one-fifth* of the whole expenses, which expenses are less than *one half* the ultimate value of the crop.

We contend that negro clothing, generally, has not advanced in price because of the tariff—nay, are prepared to say, that protection has reduced the selling value of goods required for the use of slaves: but admiting that prices are increased because of the tariff—is there not an increased ability to pay them?

On this subject, and with reference to the "*taxes*" paid by cotton planters, we shall have something to say on a future occasion. The *whole cost* of such commodities as are "taxed" by the tariff, and used in South Carolina for the supply of slaves and plantations, producing crops worth eight millions, *cannot* exceed 800,000 dollars. Then she may pay, let us admit, a *tax* of 400,000 dollars a year on these things. Her proportion of a revenue of 25,000,000 is thus determined—

As 213 representatives in congress are to 25,000,000 dollars, so are 9 representatives in congress from South Carolina, to 1,050,000 dollars—the just proportion which South Carolina ought to pay, and, possibly, may pay, on her general consumption.

ties. It would be difficult to find new articles for exportation to meet this amount. At present, the sugar planting in Louisiana, in supplies of food purchased for and consumed on the plantations, in horses and oxen required, in the subsistence of the iron and other manufacturers employed by it, furnishes a home market worth more than two millions of dollars a year to the agriculturalists of the United States. For it must he observed, that the planters, generally, purchase nearly all the corn, pork, oats, flour, horses, mules, oxen, and beef-cattle, which they need. The market thus afforded is incalculably important to the western states.

There are now from 130 to 150 steam engines on the sugar plantations. Their number would have been greater, but for the frequent agitation of the question concerning the duty on sugar.

Of the 100,000 hhds. of sugar made, about 50,000 passes up the Mississippi in steam boats—thus shewing, (in the returns added), an interior trade of five millions a year. The remainder of the crop is for the local consumption, or sent to the northern ports—employing a large amount of tonnage.

Mr. Johnston expresses an opinion, that when the estates are paid for, and a general diminution in the value of other things takes place, &c. sugar may be made for *four* cents a pound. But this low price can be obtained only by continued protection.

We shall say nothing about the reduced value of property in slaves, if the planters are forced to give up the cultivation of sugar; but, if the present value of slaves be about 450 millions of dollars, the want of the Louisiana "market" for them would directly reduce that value not less than 200 millions—and it may he added, that the slaves on the sugar estates are generally better fed, clothed and provided for—than other field slaves—if for no other reason, because they are more valuable. But this is not all. A letter from a gentleman of Louisiana, which Mr. Johnston has approved by publishing it, says that if the labor and capital now given to the cultivation of the cane were transferred to *cotton*, the *increased* quantity would be *three hundred thousand bales!* What would he the effect of this excess in an already over-stocked market—what the effect on real and personal property in South Carolina, &c. where an inferior article is produced? These things are merely suggested—but they involve consequences of the greatest importanec to a large portion of the United States—and are deeply interesting to the union at large.

We meet with the following statement as to the amount of sugars imported and consumed in the United States—otherwise, the amount of the importations less the quantities exported in the years given:

	White sugar.	*Brown sugar.*
1821	1,884,701	37,597,072
1822	5,241,622	68,617,248
1823	977,019	38,553,551
1824	8,475,772	71,484,960
1825	890,477	49,044,478
1826	4,747,304	59,008,795
1827	3,270,912	58,093,707
1828	3,367,866	42,687,059
1829	3,020,101	47,953,715
1830	4,857,131	71,900,123

The great fluctuations in the quantities stated, were probably chiefly caused by the fulness or deficiency of the crops in Louisiana. And, as the domestic supply has been large, so has the price of sugar uniformly declined. This is the natural effect of competition.

AVERAGE PRICES OF SUGAR AT PHILADELPHIA.

Years.		*Cost.*	*Years.*	*Cost.*
1818	cwt.	$14 00	1825	9 00
1819		12 50	1826	8 18
1820		10 50	1827	8 75
1821		10 37	1828	8 00
1822		11 50	1829	7 50
1823		9 50	1830	7 62
1824		8 20		

AVERAGE PRICES AT BOSTON.

		Brown Havana.	*St. Croix*	*Porto Rico.*	*New Orleans.*
1824	100lbs.	8 62½	8 75	7 75	7 62½
1825		10 62½	10 50	9 87½	9 50
1826		9 87½	9 75	8 50	8 62½
1827		10 50	9 62½	8 75	8 62½
1828		10 62½	9 62½	9 37½	8 37½
1829		9 50	9 12½	7 75	7 50
1830		8 37½	8 75	7 87½	7 50

It thus appears that the general price of brown sugar has declined from 14 dollars to 7½ dollars since 1818. That this reduction has been mainly induced by the domestic supply, we think cannot be doubted—seeing that this supply has increased to two thirds of the whole quantity consumed, and is continually pressing itself forward to meet the entire domestic demand.

The treasury tables of 1829 rate the brown sugar imported as costing 5¼ cents per lb.—in those of 1830, the cost of such sugar is put down at 5.7 cents per lb. If these sums are truly stated, the "tax" imposed for the protection of the sugar maker of Louisiana does not amount to much! The Havana and St. Croix's sugars, however, appear by the tables given above, to be worth more in the market by about one cent per lb. than the N. Orleans. There are inferior sugars in the W. Indies which cost less than 5 cts. per lb.*—but the treasury tables, which are our best and safest guides, shew that the average price of sugar in the W. Indies, (port charges, &c. included), was not one cent less than the price at New Orleans, regard being had to the respective market values of the several productions. It would then conclusively appear, that the *real* amount of protection, (admitting that the domestic supply has no effect to reduce the price of the *foreign* article), is only one cent per lb. which *cent* employs 46 millions of dollars in capital and 38,000 laborers—causes a consumption of between two and three millions worth annually of the products of American farmers and manufacturers, and checks the growth of cotton in the amount of 300,000 bales a year—which excess, if cast upon the demand, would reduce cotton to 5 or 6 cents per lb. and diminish present profits in its cultivation not less than 12 millions of dollars; or twelve times as much as the protection afforded to sugar *apparently* amounts to. We say "apparently," for we have no doubt that the cultivation of the cane in Louisiana has a perpetual tendency to reduce the price of sugar in the West Indies. It cannot, indeed, be otherwise.

The large tracts of land that may yet be brought into the cultivation of the cane, forbids the idea of a "monopoly" for at least fifty years to come. Continued protection will yet further reduce price. Domestic competition, though sometimes injurious to individuals, is always safe to the people at large.

* It is often proclaimed, by the opponents of the "American System," that sugar may be purchased for *two* cents per lb. in the W. Indies. A false impression is thus made in the words of truth. We see that the average cost (at the treasury) of all the sugar imported in the years 1829 and 1830 was 5¼ cents per lb. This was very nearly as high as the average price at New Orleans in those years. The best Louisiana sugars, having large grains, that seem alive or moving, were worth from 5 to 5½ cents, and their quality is superior to the general run of foreign sugars imported, for taste and strength—but sugar may be purchased at *two cents per lb.* in New Orleans as well as in the West Indies. The quality regulates the price from two to 5¼ cents, or higher, according to supply and demand.

It is a fact that Porto Rico sugars have not netted *one cent.* per lb. in the New York market, in the last summer. A removal of the duty then might not have affected the *price:* it would only have afforded a *profit* to the importer. Yet this sugar came partially into competition with our own—though nearly its whole value was made up of duty, freight and charges, leaving but one cent *per lb.* to the producer. Had not the *domestic* supply been large enough to determine the general value of sugar in the New York market—it is manifest that the *American consumer* must have paid a price that would have allowed a profit to the West India producer, or American importer—but the home supply caused a loss to both, *and protected the consumer.* This is an operation which oftentimes takes place—and must, because that increased supply necessarily affects price. There is no manner of doubt, but that the protection of domestic industry has reduced the general cost of foreign commodities, in almost every instance, and with special reference to every leading manufacture which has had time sufficient to become established amongst us.

Statement of the quantity and value of molasses imported annually, from the 1st October, 1820, to the 30th September, 1829, together with the average cost per gallon, in each year.

YEARS ENDING.	*Quantity.*	*Value.*	*Average cost per gallon.*	
	Gallons.	*Dollars.*	*Cents.*	*Mills.*
30th September, 1821	9,086,982	1,719,227	18	9
" " 1822	11,990,569	2,398,355	20	
" " 1823	13,019,328	2,634,222	20	2
" " 1824	13,117,724	2,413,643	18	3
" " 1825	12,535,062	2,547,715	20	3
" " 1826	13,843,045	2,838,728	20	5
" " 1827	13,376,502	2,818,982	21	
" " 1828	13,393,651	2,788,471	20	8
" " 1829	10,150,224	1,484,104	14	6
" " 1830	8,374,139	995,766	12	nearly.

We have the following statement of the cost of molasses in the West Indies—expenses of the cask 7 cents per gallon, leakage and small charges 3, *original cost* 3—total 13. This is considerably lower than the average value put down in the treasury tables, though 1 cent more than the cost per gallon last year. Freight and duty are to be added to make up the value in the U. States. The cost of freight on molasses from New Orleans to the Atlantic ports, is about the same as from Havana, but employs more tonnage, reference being had to the quantity transported.

We do not admit that duties must needs be "taxes"—nor shall we contend that they always reduce the price of those foreign commodities on which they act—but it is pretty well ascertained that such reductions have happened. The price of molasses in the United States averaged 37½ cents a gallon for the 12 years from 1816 to 1827 inclusive, when the duty was five cents a gallon; but for the three years 1828, 1829 and 1830, when the duty was ten cents a gallon, the average price was only 27 2-3 cents per gallon. A reduced price in the United States, certainly, succeeded an increased duty: and a reference to the table just above presented shows, that the *cost* of the foreign article was 19.6 cents from 1821 to 1827 inclusive, the duty being 5 cents, and only 15.3 cents in 1828, 1829 and 1830, when the duty was 10 cents per gallon. And this it was that brought down the first cost of molasses to *three* cents per gallon, as stated in a preceding paragraph. It had been much more, and is now, at the latest advices about 11 cents per gallon, exclusive of the cost of the cask, duties and all other charges—the whole cost being about than 21 cents per gallon. The price at New Orleans, on the levee, that is, ready for shipping, all charges paid, is 26 cents. This molasses is 2 or 3 cents per gallon better than the Havana, generally. The middling and inferior qualities of the New Orleans, we see in the prices current, are worth five cents per gallon more than the like qualities of Havana molasses, in the Baltimore market. Thus the duty on the latter would appear practically inoperative; and so, indeed, it is partially rendered by the better commodity of domestic product.

In support of the probable facts just suggested, it may be mentioned—that salt at Turk's Island, was 10 cents a bushel, when our duty was 20 cents,—but now 20 cents, the duty being 10 cents. May we not believe that this advance in price has been, more or less, caused by our increased demand? Can we do otherwise than apprehend, that that demand will reduce the domestic manufacture of salt? The present price of Turk's Island salt at Baltimore is 43 cents per bushel—duty 10 cents. At this time in 1830, it was about 47 cents—duty 20 cents. We shall see if this salt does not hold an increased price compared with the amount of the duty. Such has been the result of past experience—and like causes have not failed to produce like effects.

Good Louisiana sugar sold at Louisville, Kentucky, in January 1829, at 7¼ cents by the barrel. 39,063 hhds. and 1756 bbls. of sugar and 18,429 hhds. and 2,505 bbls. of molasses were sent to the northern ports of the United States from New Orleans in the year ending 30th September 1828—the up-river trade was about the same. In 1829, the whole product was 87,965 hhds. of sugar, and 39,874 hhds.

molasses—206 additional plantations were commenced in this year; that of 1830–31 has been computed at 100,000 hhds. sugar and about 45,000 hhds. molasses.

We shall conclude by offering the following exhibit of the

Consumption of sugar in Great Britain.

In 1700 it was only	10,000	tons or	22,000,000 lbs.
1710	14,000		31,360,000
1734	42,000		94,080,000
1754	53,270		119,320,000
1770 to 1775 average	72,500		162,500,000
1786 to 1790	81,000		181,500,000

During the first half of the last century the consumption of sugar increased five fold.

The duty on foreign sugar is a *prohibitory* one of 63 shillings a cwt. On East India sugar 37 shillings, or 10 shillings *more* than on West India sugar. From the Mauritius, it is, by a special provision, allowed to be imported at the low duty.

At present (1831) the revenue derived from sugar and molasses in Great Britain and Ireland may be estimated at about 5,000,000*l*. Thus,—

160,000 tons consumed in Great Britain at 27s. per cwt.,	duty is	4,320,000*l*.
16,000 do. in Ireland at	do	430,000*l*.
20,000 do. molasses at 10*l*. per ton, converted into coarse sugar, *bastards* and treacle,		200,000*l*.
		4,950,000*l*.

The price of sugar, exclusive of the duty, may be taken at an average of the last few years at from 30 to 35 shillings.

This small table is presented to show the extent to which Great Britain proceeds to defend her West India colonies. She *prohibits* foreign sugar, and levies an *extra* duty of 10*s*. per cwt. (or more than *two* cents per lb.) on the produce of her own East India colonies; but the whole duty that we impose on foreign sugar to protect *our own* production, is no more than 3 cents per lb. And this strong fact further appears, that sugar in England, at the average of 32*s*. 6*d*. exclusive of the duty, but taking into consideration the general rates of exchange, or *actual par* of the value which we place on the dollar, measured by that which England places on gold, or her pound sterling, is very nearly *eight* dollars per cwt. or as dear as our sugar at *Boston*, though "taxed" three cents per lb. as we are told that it is! There is much matter for reflection in the facts just stated.

REPORT ON FOREIGN TARIFFS.

The committee appointed to prepare and report a schedule of rates and duties exacted on the principal exports of the United States, in the ports of Great Britain, Holland and Belgium, France and Russia; and the duties levied on some of the exports of those nations, when imported into the United States, beg leave to report:

That they have no data to enable them to comply with the instructions of the convention, so far as regards Holland and Belgium.

BRITISH DUTIES.

The duties on bread stuffs are prohibitory, unless in times of dearth.

For example—

When the quarter of wheat, of 8 Winchester bushels, averages 45*s.*, the duty is 41*s.*, or about 90 per cent., and in that proportion for flour.—When the price of the quarter of wheat is 50*s.* the duty is 36*s.* 3*d.*, or about 70 per cent. When the quarter is 62*s.* the duty is 24*s.* 8*d.* When the price of the quarter is 68*s.* the duty is 16*s.* 8d.

When barley is 16*s.* per quarter, the duty is 37*s.* 10*d.*, or nearly 240 per cent. When the price is 24*s.* the duty is 25*s.* When the price is 33*s.*, the duty is 12*s.* 4*d.*

When rye is 19*s.*, the duty is 40*s.* When the price is 16*s.* the duty is 22*s.* 9*d.*

The duty on rice is 15*s.* sterling per cwt. being somewhat more than 100 per cent.

On manufactured tobacco per lb. 9*s.* sterling, or about 2,000 per cent.

On leaf tobacco 3*s.* per lb. or 1,200 per cent.

The duties on our lumber and some other articles, are from 400 to 1,500 per cent. more than on similar articles imported from British Colonies. The difference is so great, that if the articles were procured here gratis, and transported free of freight, they would not in many cases be worth shipping.

We annex a few instances, out of above fifty, enumerated in a recent British publication.

	From the U. States.	*From British Colonies.*
Fir quarters per 120,	362*s.* sterling.	65*s.*
Wainscot logs,	55*s.*	12*s.*
Olive wood, per ton,	169*s.* 6*d.*	12*s.* 4*d.*
Oars, per 120,	299*s.* 3*d.*	19*s.* 6*d.*
Spermaceti oil, per ton,	532*s.*	1*s.*
Un-enumerated timber, per ton,	28*s.*	5*s.*
Castor nuts, per cwt.	18*s.* 8*d.*	6*d.*
Lath-wood, above 12 feet long, per fathom,	272*s.*	25*s.*
Hemp seed,	40*s.*	1*s.*

In consequence of the difference, so far as regards lumber, the whole amount of the various species of this staple, which we exported to Great Britain in 1829, was $23,565.

FRENCH DUTIES.

The regulation of the duties on the importation of bread stuffs into France, are somewhat complicated. There are four classes of departments, in which the averages, whereby the duties are ascertained, vary considerably. It is not necessary to go into detail of the whole, and we shall therefore confine ourselves to the third class in which Havre and Rouen are situated.

When the price of the hectolitre (two Winchester bushels and seven eighths) of wheat, at Havre, is below 20 francs (3 dollars 69 cents), the importation is prohibited; when the price is above 22 francs, the duty is 25 centimes per hectolitre; when at 22 francs, the duty is 1 franc 25 centimes; when at 21 francs, the duty is 2 francs 25 centimes; when below 21 francs, the duty is 3 francs.

N. B. A new system of duties on bread stuffs is at present before the chambers.

When the price of wheat at Havre is above 22 francs the hectolitre, the duty on rice is 50 centimes per hectolitre; when at 22 francs, the duty is 2 francs 50 centimes; when at 21 francs, duty 4 francs 50 centimes; when at 20 francs, duty 6 francs 50 centimes: when below 20, duty 9 francs 75 centimes.

Manufactured tobacco is prohibited altogether. Leaf tobacco can only be imported for consumption by the *regie*. The fabrication and sale are a government monopoly. Individuals may, however, import leaf tobacco, to be stored, and re-exported within eighteen months, unless purchased by the regie. Tobacco stored for the purchase of the regie, or for exportation, pays no duty.

RUSSIAN DUTIES.

Duty on leaf tobacco, per lb. about	2 cents.
Tobacco in rolls, or cut, and of all kinds for smoking, per lb.	28½
Cigars and snuff,	71
Fish, salted, smoked, or prepared in any way	7
Bowsprits, yards, masts, and ends of masts, per piece	64
Spun cotton, per lb.	8
Colored cotton,	9½
Wheat, per bushel,	25

Flour, double the duty on wheat.

Russia does not depend for the protection of her manufactures on prohibitory duties. She prohibits, under penalty of confiscation, nearly all the articles with which she can supply herself. There are in her tariff from forty to fifty prohibitions, many of them genera, embracing various species—for instance, all kinds of skins, all manufactures of iron, of fine steel, wood, leather, gold, silver, platina, &c. &c. &c.*

AMERICAN DUTIES

On British Merchandize.

It would extend this report too far, to notice the various articles imported from Great Britain; we shall therefore confine ourselves to the principal ones—iron, woollens, and cottons.

*We stop the press to say, that, by a new Russian tariff just received, an additional duty of 12 1-2 per cent. has been laid on *all* imports, excepting brimstone, corks and corkwood, and the duty on certain specified articles has been further increased. *Permanent Committee.*

The duty on iron in bars or bolts, $37 per ton.
Iron in pigs, 62½ cents per cwt.
Vessels of cast iron, 1½ cent per lb.
Castings not specified, 1 cent per lb.

The duty on woollens below four dollars per yard, is 45 per cent.—above four dollars, 50 per cent.

But cases occur in which the duty is much higher: as woollens below 50 cents, pay duty as if they cost 50 cents; above 50 cents, and below one dollar, they pay duty as if they cost one dollar; above one dollar, and below $2 50, they pay duty as if they cost $2 50; and if above $2 50, and below $4, as if they cost $4. Thus a yard of broad cloth that cost $3, is rated at $4, and pays $1 80, being 60 per cent. But the importers here, and the shippers in Europe, knowing the state of the tariff, regulate their orders and supplies accordingly; and it is believed that the quantity imported that pays higher duty than 45 or 50 per cent. bears but a very small proportion to the great mass of our importations of woollen goods.

Cotton goods below 35 cents the square yard, pay 25 per cent. on 35 cents. Those at and above 35 cents, pay 25 per cent. duty on the actual cost. This duty is almost as prohibitory of all the very low priced cottons, as the British Corn Laws are of our bread stuffs.

On French Merchandize.

The principal articles imported from France are silks, brandies, wines, and cambrics.

The duty on French silks, is	20 per cent.
On brandy, according to proof, per gallon,	53 to 63 cents.
Wines,	10 cents.
Cambrics,	25 per cent.

On Russian Merchandize.

The principal articles imported from Russia are iron, hemp, flax, cordage, and sail duck.

The duty on iron is already stated under the head of the duties on British merchandize.

Tarred cordage is 4 cents, and untarred 5 cents per lb.

Sail duck, 10½ cents per square yard. It is to be raised half a cent a year till it reaches 12½.

Hemp, 60 dollars per ton.

Flax, 50 dollars per ton.

It cannot be irrelevant to state, that on all the merchandize rated ad valorem, imported into this country in 1830, amounting to $45,230,926, the duties averaged only 25.78 per cent.—of the whole amount $12,618,862 were below 25 per cent.—$23,168,079 at 25 per cent.—and only $9,443,995 above 25 per cent. The total importation of that year was $70,876,920, of which $12,746,245 were free of duty, leaving about $12,909,749 for teas, coffee, cocoa, wines, sugar, salt, coals, spices, and all manufactured articles subject to specific duties.

All which is respectfully submitted.

MATHEW CAREY,
ABBOT LAWRENCE,
J. W. McCULLOH,
Committee.

New York, October 31, 1831.

REPORT ON WOOL AND WOOLLENS.

Report of the committee on the manufacture of wool.

The committee directed by the convention of the friends of Domestic Industry, convened in New York, in October last, represent to the permanent committee, that the committee on the manufacture of wool forthwith issued circulars, with various interrogatories, to the manufacturers of wool, in the several states represented in the convention. That they have as yet received but partial returns, and ask leave of the permanent committee, for further time to complete their report. It is much to be regretted that the requisition of the permanent committee cannot earlier be complied with, in submitting the actual returns. But when it is considered over what an extent of country these inquiries reach, it is not surprising that information of such magnitude should require more time for the actual returns. From information already received, and from calculations based upon that information, the committee are justified in submitting the following as general results:—in thus doing, they, with much confidence, believe that the amount will fall short of the actual returns, as to the ultimate value of the manufactures of wool.

All which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) E. H. ROBBINS, *chairman.*

No. 1.

The probable number of sheep in the United States is 20,000,000, and worth on an average $2 per head,	$40,000,000
The sheep farms generally do not support three sheep to the acre, summer and winter, though the land be pretty good and well managed. Of the 20 millions of sheep, it is supposed that about 5 millions are in the state of New York, having had 3,496,539 in 1825, the latest returns at hand; and it is known that many of these sheep are fed upon lands worth from 15 to 30 dollars per acre—and in Duchess county, in which are over 500,000 sheep, the lands on which they are fed are worth about $25 per acre. It is then probable, that the average worth of farms in the United States, capable of supporting three sheep to every acre, throughout the year, are worth $10 the acre: 20 millions of sheep will require 6,666,666 acres—say 6,500,000 acres, at $10	65,000,000
Capital in sheep, and lands to feed them	$105,000,000
The 20 millions of sheep produce 50 millions of pounds of wool, annually, the average value of which, for three years, 1829, 1830, 1831, exceeded 40 cts. per lb. or $20,000,000. (The crop of 1831, was worth more than $25,000,000.) The crop of wool, having reference to the whole quantity made into cloth of various qualities, is worth $40,000,000, which is about the gross annual product of wool and its manufactures in the United States. If the woollen	

goods imported, valued at 6 millions of dollars, be added, there will be allowed for each person in the United States, 3½ dollars worth of woollen goods per annum, including blankets, carpets, &c. as well as clothing.

The fixed and floating capital vested in the woollen manufactories in the United States, such as lands, water rights, buildings, machinery and stock on hand, and cash employed, may be estimated at 40,000,000

Capital directly vested in the growth and manufacture of wool $145,000,000

The proportion between the amount of wool used in the factories and worked up by household industry, are as 3 to 2; and on the average, it will employ one person to work up 1,000 lbs. of wool annually, or 50,000 persons in the whole.

It is reasonable to suppose that each laborer subsists two other persons:—say 150,000 in all, deriving a direct support from the woollen manufacture, whether household or otherwise.

Each person will consume at least twenty-five dollars worth of agricultural products annually, or $3,750,000 worth of subsistence.

The average products of farms, cultivated for the supply of food, does not exceed $2 50 per acre yearly, after subsisting the cultivators and those dependent on them. It will therefore require 1,500,000 acres of land to feed those manufacturers and their dependants—worth, say $15 per acre, is 22,500,000

Capital involved in the growth and manufacture of wool in the U. S. $167,500,000

The annual value created by, or accruing to agriculture, because of the growth and manufacture of wool, may be thus shewn:

Wool,	$20,000,000
Provisions to manufacturers,	3,750,000
Fuel, timber, and other products of the land, supplied,	500,000
Charges for transportation, and food of horses and other animals employed, because of the factories,	500,000
	$24,750,000

The following should rightfully be added, to show the whole operation of the woollen manufactures in the United States:

For every 100,000 lbs. of wool manufactured, there is a constant employment, equal to the labor of six men, in the erection and repair of buildings, mill-wrights and blacksmiths' work, and in the building and repairing of machinery, whether for wool worked up in the factories or in families—say 3,000 men, whose labor subsists at least 9,000 other persons—12,000 in all, and consume each $25 worth of agricultural produce, annually, is 300,000

$25,050,000

Making the whole number of persons employed, because of the manufacture of wool, 162,000: and requiring of the product of agriculture, for materials and subsistence, the very large amount, per annum, of twenty-five millions and fifty thousand dollars. And it should be observed that there is no foreign market to which we can send our 25 millions worth of wool and bread-stuffs and meats. It would all be as if annually lost to landholders and cultivators were the home-market destroyed, in abandoning the manufactures of wool; and those who are now consumers of the products of agriculture, must, of necessity, become producers, and lessen the prices of grain, &c.

No. 2

The subject of the woollen manufacture might be much further pursued, as to the employment of persons and capital, in various other branches of industry connected with it. Making of iron, mining coal, the whale fishery, the foreign and coasting trade, and all the dependent interests. The woollen manufacture is a great stimulant to the whale fishery, consuming annually about 180,000 gallons of oil.

The following statement will show its benefits to the navigating interest alone, independent of the coasting trade and fisheries.

A woollen factory, manufacturing 100,000 lbs. of wool per annum, into 40,000 yards of 6-4 wide cloths, will require of the productions of foreign countries, on which *freights* would accrue, as follows:

20 pipes of olive oil from Leghorn, a $10 per pipe	$200	
100 boxes (of 100 lbs. each) of oil soap a $1	100	
4,000 lbs. of Bengal Indigo, at 3 cents per lb.	120	
15 tons dye wood a $6	90	
3 tons madder, a $10 (Holland)	30	
600 gallons sperm oil,	200	
Other articles of foreign production	10	
		$750
The freight on the above 40,000 yards from Europe to the United States, is known to be, and is so set down at		500
Gain to our navigation in freight on the manufacture of every 100,000 pounds of wool,		$250

NOTE BY THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE.

It is worthy of remark, as shewing the great international exchanges of value caused by manufactures—that, though New York probably produces one-fourth of all the wool grown in the United States, Massachusetts manufactures one-fourth. The first exports large quantities of wool and flour and cattle, &c. to Massachusetts—so does Pennsylvania and the far-west. The wool sold by the farmers of the small state of Vermont, last year, is estimated as having been worth $1,200,000.

COASTING TRADE AND INTERNAL COMMERCE.

Mr. D. W. COXE, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of the Committee to which was referred the subject of the Coasting Trade and Internal Commerce of the United States, and the inquiry how far the protection of American Manufactures had tended to improve them, made the following

REPORT:

That these great interests are so intimately connected with each other, and with the foreign relations of the country, that it will be necessary to examine the entire ground in order to understand the subject in all its aspects and bearings.

The exports of domestic produce and manufactures for the year ending the 30th Sept., 1830, are divided according to the Treasury Report as follows:

Of the Sea,	$1,725,270
Of the Forest,	4,192,047
Of Agriculture,	46,977,332
Of Manufactures,	6,567,383
Amount of domestic produce,	$59,462,032
Exports of foreign produce and manufactures during the same period,	14,387,479
Making the total amount of exports for that year,	$73,849,511
The imports from foreign countries, during the same time, were	70,876,920
The exports employed of domestic tonnage,	971,760 tons.
of foreign do.	133,436
Aggregate tonnage employed in exporting for the year,	1,105,196 tons.
The real aggregate amount of American registered and coasting tonnage for the year ending the 31st Dec. 1829, was	1,260,798 tons.
Whereof the registered employed in foreign trade, was	650,143
enrolled and licensed coasting tonnage,	610,655
	1,260,798*

*The whale fishery employed by the last returns 200 ships, measuring 102,500 tons, valued at $7,500,000, and their fishing avails at $3,540,000.

To which add vessels sold to foreigners, lost and condemned, in 1829, - - - -	43,240 tons.	
Also add the difference during a period of many previous years, arising from sales, losses, and condemnations, never before corrected, - - - - -	514,452	
		557,692
The apparent aggregate tonnage before the account was corrected, thus appears to have been		1,818,490 tons.
The apparent aggregate of the year 1828, was		1,741,391 "
The increase in 1829 over 1828, was therefore		77,099 tons.

It appears, by the foregoing statement of the tonnage of the United States, that there has been a misconception in regard to its real amount, arising from the omission until last year, to credit the tonnage account kept by the Treasury Department, with the accumulated list of losses, sales, and condemnations for many previous years. It must however be recollected, that many vessels owned in the United States, trade under foreign flags, and therefore do not appear in the tonnage account. It is also well known, that the great improvements made in ship-building of late years, by combining the carriage of large burdens with fast sailing, have given this country a decided advantage over all others in the despatch of business; whence it may be inferred that the United States gain in celerity—in the performance of effective duty, and the preference obtained in the freighting business, at least one-fifth over their most judicious competitors (the British,) so that it would not be extravagant to estimate the 1,260,798 tons of American shipping as equivalent, at one-fifth gain, to 1,512,957 tons of that of other nations. It may be here remarked, that the magnitude and extent of the American bays, rivers, and lakes, call into existence two descriptions of boats, unknown in Europe, which navigate the Mississippi, Alabama, Tombigbee, and other large rivers of the West and South, with their tributary waters. These boats, carrying 30 to 50 tons, are to be seen in countless numbers, on the Mississippi and Ohio especially, and are not licensed, or noticed in the custom house reports. By a conjectural estimate they amount to 150 to 200,000 tons, on the various waters of the United States. To these may be added, the coal-boats of the Susquehannah, Delaware, Lehigh, Schuylkill, and Lackawaxen, which this year delivered 200,000 tons of coal at Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York. This single item employed last year 1172 coasting vessels, measuring 100,966 tons, and will, when coal becomes more generally used for steam engines and domestic purposes, require probably more tonnage than the entire present amount of our coasting trade, and ere long will far outstrip the fisheries, which in 1828 employed 100,796 tons. The steam boat tonnage is now about 75,000 tons, having greatly increased within the last two years. By means of steam the transfers and exchanges of merchandize are now effected with a celerity that can only be compared to the remittances of bank notes and drafts by mail, or to the circulation of the blood through the arteries and veins of the human body. It is a truly *national vehicle*, the practical and political benefits of which, by bringing distant points of the Union into closer contact, will soon receive a more thorough developement by the *completion* of the system of *Rail-Roads* and *Canals*, now in a course of execution.

In approaching the consideration of the value of the annual internal commerce of this great and growing country, the committee are aware of the difficulty of ascertaining its precise amount and extent, there being no fixed and determinate data to aid their investigation, as in the case of imports and exports passing through the ordeal of the custom houses. They have however essayed different modes in order to approximate to something like a satisfactory result. 1st. Estimating the average annual exports and imports at only 70 millions of dollars each, employing about 1,100,000 tons of American and foreign shipping, and supposing those two sums quadrupled, as well as the number of voyages or trips made by the tonnage employed in the coasting and internal communications of the country, it gives a gross sum of 560 millions of dollars, as the value of the floating mass of property annually changing hands and in a state of transit through the United States. 2d Test. The population of the United States is now 13 millions of souls; one-fifth whereof, or 2,600,000 persons, are probably of a productive age and capacity, earning for 300 days in the year, seventy-five cents, as the estimated value of their labour to the country, which would produce a sum of 585 millions of dollars. Now, this would appear a moderate computation, on Adam Smith's principle, that "the gross revenue of all the inhabitants of a great country, comprehends the whole annual produce of their land and labour." 3d Test. Suppose the daily expense of 13 millions of inhabitants for food, raiment, repairs of and replacing implements of labour, education, amusements, and all incidental expenses, equal only to twelve and a half cents each, it gives a fraction less than 587 millions of dollars. Again: 4th Test. France, according to high authority, with a population of 32 millions of souls, derives from agriculture, commerce and manufactures, an annual income of 7000 million of francs, equal at 5 francs to the dollar, to 1400 millions of dollars, which in the ratio of the population of the United States, gives 570 millions of dollars gross revenue. These various comparisons seem to justify the conclusion, that 700 millions of dollars are not too large an estimate for this country, where labour is better rewarded than in the old world.* The composition and details of this sum, it would, however, be impossible even to surmise, until the reports of the different committees, appointed on the various branches of manufacturing industry, shall have been completed. Thus it appears, that the 70 millions of dollars exported from the United States, form only one-tenth part of their aggregate annual income, and as the greater part of the returns or imports consist of articles manufactured by machinery from wool, cotton, silk, flax, hemp, wood, iron, and other metals, it follows that the United States exchange their rude products and manual labour against commodities which they might with the aid of that machinery, and a small addition of manual labour, manufacture at home. Considering trade, therefore, as but an exchange of commodities, it is evident, that the nation whose labour is so divided and applied as to produce the greatest variety and value, exchanges with others to the greatest profit; and the country which gives its rude materials in return for manufactures, labours to a dis-

* "It will be found on a calculation, that if only $100,000,000 of *accumulation* or *profits* were added *every year* to the *fixed capital*, *improvements* and *money investments* of a country, they would, either on the principle of compound interest, or by the simple effect of an *annual addition*, so augment in value, as greatly to resemble the fable of the *barley-corn* or *horse-shoe nails*.

advantage proportionate to the multiplying power of the machinery used by the other party—that is, the labour of one man in the United States is given in payment for the 100th to a 300th part (as the case may be) of one working in Europe. This is partially exemplified by the improved spinning frame, which produces, with the accompanying apparatus, and the aid of a boy, as much yarn as 400 common spinning wheels. These inferences are corroborated by the fact, that the cotton, which costs here six millions of dollars, is worth, when manufactured in the United States, *by machinery*, thirty millions of dollars; but in England, where finer goods are made, the same quantity of cotton produces about sixty millions of dollars. This corresponds with Mr. Huskisson's general estimate of the aggregate value of the *cotton* manufactures of Great Britain, which he stated in 1826 at 37 millions sterling, equal to 180 millions of dollars—that is, the 18 millions of dollars cost of 250 millions of pounds weight of cotton annually consumed in England, is multiplied tenfold in value by machinery.—— Here, then, is a solution of the problem of British wealth and power, the foundation of which is manufactures, considered as the creation of the inventive power of man.

The effect of adequate protection to this most important branch of industry, may be made intelligible to the plainest understanding, by the following statement:—The one million of bales of cotton grown annually in the United States, would produce, with the aid of machinery and a small proportion of their population, (five sixths of which might be females and children, as in Great Britain,) the amazing sum of three hundred millions of dollars. The spindle and the loom, put in motion by steam and the extensive waterfalls so common in this country, would equip fleets, pay armies, build cities, sustain agriculture, nourish commerce, and spread their influence over the multifarious arts of civilized life.

Immediately connected with this immense mass of floating property, estimated at seven hundred millions of dollars, and with the fixed capital and real estate of the nation,* is a uniform and sound currency, as the instrument of circulation and distribution by means of which sales, purchases and exchanges are effected. Emerging from the war of the revolution, deeply impressed with the baneful effects of a depreciated paper currency, the framers of the present constitution saw the necessity of a fixed national standard of money, and accordingly the sole power to regulate commerce, levy duties and taxes and coin money was vested in congress, and the states prohibited from emitting bills of credit, coining, or making any thing but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts. The first Bank of the United States and the Mint were established the same session. Although the restricted power of the states might fairly have been construed into an interdict to establish banks circulating paper in the nature of currency, yet the circumstance of the existence of the bank of North America at the period of the adoption of the federal constitution, furnished the states a pretext for extending those institutions, to the manifest perversion of the spirit and meaning of the limitation of power just referred to. State banks soon multiplied throughout the Union, in many of which the states them-

* The capital invested in *manufactures alone*, is estimated at $250,000,000, and it is worthy of remark, that the annual consumption of cotton, estimated at 200,000 bales, exceeds *all* that South Carolina exports of that article, which last year was but 185,166 bales.

selves became partners, and thereby more directly violated the prohibitory clause. The expiration of the charter of the first bank of the United States the year previous to the war with Great Britain in 1812, excited a powerful feeling among the state institutions against its renewal, which only failed in the senate by the casting vote of the vice president, so that with the fall of that important institution at the approaching crisis of hostilities with England, all check and control over the issues of notes by the state banks ceased, and the subsequent suspension of specie payments was followed by further and yet more extravagant issues. The effect of those measures it is well known was so to deluge the country with bank notes as to cause their depreciation, and contributed to give that fictitious value to property of every kind, which five years after led to the necessity of chartering the present bank of the United States as the sole means of compelling a return to specie payments. The sacrifices by which this important event was preceded and followed, conveyed a salutary lesson both to the states and the general government, which cannot be lost to the nation. If the principle is to be considered as now settled by long usage, that the state bank notes are henceforward to constitute a part of our circulating medium, experience has also demonstrated the paramount necessity of a great national institution to manage the fiscal concerns of the nation, collect and distribute its revenues, control and regulate its currency, give security and stability to property, and support and assistance to those banks which are prudently managed. Without a national currency, receivable at the most distant points, the Union itself would be insecure, and its money concerns with the whole business of sales, purchases, exchanges, and remittances, liable to be again thrown into utter confusion, by the fluctuating and uncertain value of state bank notes, for which no other remedy can be suggested than either a circulating medium exclusively metallic (as in France,) or a great national institution, administered on the liberal and comprehensive principles of the present Bank of the U. States. With a view to some ulterior deductions, the committee present the following comparison between the currencies of the three principal commercial nations in the world, Great Britain, France and the United States.

That of Great Britain and Ireland, consists of about $320,000,000, half of gold and silver, and half of bank notes.

That of France of about $450,000,000, all specie, excepting about one tenth.

That of the United States consisted on the 1st of January, 1830, of the bank notes of 330 banks, including that of the United States, the aggregate capitals of which amounted to $145,000,000, their joint circulation in notes to $62,500,000; and their deposits, which must be considered as money, to $55,500,000; making a total of $118,000,000, which is sustained by a sum of only $22,000,000 in specie, deposited in the different banks, making no part of the circulation. It is also conjectured that the silver coins actually circulating in the United States, and which form no part of the above $22,000,000, amount to about $10,000,000. This sum of $10,000,000 is supposed equivalent to the bank notes on hand, and not circulating when the specie is out, so that the aggregate currency is as above stated, about $118,000,000. From these estimates, drawn from Mr. Gallatin's Considerations on the Currency and Banking System, it appears that

the currency of the United States is greatly inferior in point of metallic security to that of France, and even less solid than that of Great Britain.—Hence the obvious necessity, owing to our intimate relations with those countries, and the multiplication of state banks in this country, connected with the misjudged opposition of some of the states to the bank of the United States, of observing a greater degree of caution in a paper circulation now consisting of the notes of 330 banks, and which are going on increasing. A currency so diversified, extending over 24 states, can with difficulty be maintained in a sound condition, by even the controlling influence and vigilant precautions of one great federal institution, which has the arduous duty to perform, of aiding and supporting all the sound state banks, with a view to its own security and the maintenance of public and private credit. The prodigious extent and magnitude of that system, may be inferred from the foregoing data, and the additional fact that during the year ending the 30th June last, the bank of the United States and its branches purchased bills amounting to $44,053,520, and furnished drafts to the amount of $42,123,161, besides transferring $12,460,000 for the government, from one point to another of the Union, and exchanging nearly $100,000,000 with the state banks, constituting an aggregate of about $200,000,000 in the nature of circulation, besides its discounts and loans. In these operations the people of the United States have the satisfaction to behold the security afforded by a sound currency, regulated and sustained by an institution truly national in its origin, its purpose and its management, to the immense mass and value of property constantly in motion, in addition to the fixed capital and real estate of the country. There are however, some highly disadvantageous circumstances connected with the exchanges with foreign countries that require particular notice. As already remarked, France and Great Britain, with which the foreign trade of this country is chiefly carried on, possess a more solid metalic currency than the United States, and are therefore less liable to be affected by a free issue of bank notes or a sudden withdrawal of specie, as often occurs here by over importations, or an unfavorable state of the foreign exchanges. These over importations are the natural consequence of the long credits given on duties on imports, coming of late years principally from England, which, on certain goods are equivalent to the first cost; thus a person obtaining a credit in England of twelve months for $10,000, and ten months (the average credit) on the duties here, acquires the use of $20,000 to speculate or trade upon for nearly twelve months. So that if a house in England or the United States becomes embarrassed, relief may be obtained by this easy method, as is well known to the government, which has sustained heavy losses on duties bonded, but never paid. With such inducements and facilities to overtrading, the country is constantly inundated with a flood of goods from England, which being thrown immediately into the hands of auctioneers, are instantly sold, and bills or specie (as may best suit) forthwith remitted. Importations rapidly succeed each other, and the obvious result is, that exchange rises, the banks are drained of their specie to ship to Europe, discounts are curtailed, circulation is diminished, pecuniary distress follows, goods fall for the moment, a deep wound is inflicted on domestic industry, especially on the manufacturing classes, and for this evil the country demands a remedy. Fortunately it is not difficult, and consists in the adoption of the same ware-

housing system practiced in Europe, with the abolishment of all credits on duties. There is yet another evil which contributes with the foregoing to the frequent and sudden disappearance of specie. The gold coins of the United States are rated about four per cent. below the British standard, and consequently, whenever the state of exchange favours the operation, gold is sent in preference to bills, and in truth this inequality of comparative value with silver, furnishes a never ceasing inducement to collect and hoard it up with a view to the European demand.

From this cause the gold coins vanish as fast as they issue from the mint, or what is the same thing, the gold bullion is shipped without being coined. This inconvenience admits of as speedy a remedy as the other.—Congress has only to enact a law, raising the value of gold to the same relative proportion to silver that it bears in England. Indeed it is of the highest importance that the standard of value of the precious metals should be the same throughout the commercial world.

Your committee next proceed to the consideration of other points affecting the prosperity and internal commerce of the United States, which though of a less specific character, and not coming strictly within the terms of the resolution under which they act, appear to fall within its general scope and intention.

It is obvious that the unrestricted intercourse among nations, recommended by modern economists, can only be the result of conventional stipulations between the parties, in the form of treaties, or the reciprocal abolition of duties or interdicts on each other's industry, and that such relaxation, if beneficial as a general measure, ought to commence with the governments whose capital, skill, and low rate of wages, place them on the vantage ground, and not from one yet in a comparative state of infancy, and deficient in those essential prerequisites to a perfect equality in the proposed liberal competition for the benefits of free trade. A reference, however, to the actual condition of the commercial world, will show that no such changes have taken place, or are in contemplation, and indicates better than abstract reasoning or theories, the true position of the United States. This will appear to be marked by numerous peculiarities, distinguishing it in a remarkable degree from that of the old world, requiring a distinct policy, and that its industry and efforts should be directed rather into the new channels opening throughout the Western hemisphere, than confined to those long clogged and obstructed by the restrictive measures of Europe.

The artificial colonial system of that portion of the globe, can furnish no just rule of conduct for a nation, which having burst the fetters which abound it originlly to that system, now finds itself occupying rival and opposite ground, connected with the principles on which that separation was accomplished. A very superficial glance at the origin and progress of commerce and manufactures elsewhere, may serve to elucidate this subject, and fix our contemplation on that new era and condition of the civilized world, in which it found itself placed by the prominent events of the last few centuries, and more especially of the last forty years. After Europe had begun to emerge from the barbarism and ignorance in which it lay buried during the long benighted period of the middle ages, one of the incidents which accidentally contributed to the advancement of civilization and industry, was the chivalrous fanaticism that led to the invasion of

the Holy Land. The return of the crusaders, especially the Venitian and Genoese vessels, from that distant expedition, first introduced into Italy the fabrics of Asia and the East. Manufactures of silk and cloth were thus established in the Italian cities, and an inland intercourse commenced with India. A taste for these luxuries soon communicated itself to Spain, Portugal, Flanders, the Hanseatic towns, and subsequently to France and England; each alternately became the seat of trade and the rising arts, which changed their abode, or fixed their residence, as adventitious causes happened to attract them. The ambition, rivalry, and competition of the world have since driven them to and fro, as the winds impel the currents, the clouds and the tempests. It may here be remarked, that this fact is at variance with the supposition that nature designates, by soil, climate, or other marked preferences and indications of superior fitness, the exclusive occupation and destiny of every nation. The error is yet more signally exposed by another remarkable fact. The Baltic countries, with their vast mines and founderies of iron, produce notwithstanding its superior quality, no fine cutlery or hardwares, like Birmingham or Sheffield. Spain, with the finest merino fleeces, is not distinguished for her cloths; while England, on the contrary, originally importing her iron, without the fine wool, or cotton of more favoured countries, rivals them all in those important branches, and in spite of her inability to propagate the silk-worm, now competes successfully with France in the substance and quality of her silken fabrics; and as if to baffle and refute all calculations on the advantages of original possession, Italy, Spain and Portugal, which took the lead in the discoveries and commerce of India and the Americas, have lost their consequence, and sunk into inactivity and indolence. Finally—manufactures, like commerce, have taken deepest root and flourish most in those countries which were the last to introduce them, and where they seemed likely to abide, until driven or attracted into some new channel.

Your Committee cannot here refrain from adverting to that period when England, from whose good stock the American people are chiefly descended, planted this favoured land with her discontented sons, who fleeing from political and religious oppression, during the reign of the house of Stuart, brought with them that knowledge of their natural rights and the principles of the British Constitution, that hatred of tyranny, which laid the foundation of civil liberty in these States. The circumstances connected with the first settlement of this country, and which attended its subsequent career until its final separation from Great Britain, were so peculiar and auspicious to the inculcation and establishment of constitutional freedom, as to authorize the presumption, if not belief, that no nation in the lapse of ages can ever again arise, uniting so many and such perfect materials with which to build up a great and imperishable political fabric. The abolition of the rights of primogeniture—equality of property, allodial or freehold tenures of land, are precious ingredients in the composition of its government, and with the wise and general provision for education, are sufficent to ensure its permanence and security, whilst the greater part of Europe, on the contrary, presents the sad spectacle of a population debarred by its institutions and the feudal origin of its titles, from any prospect of bettering its condition—hence, they feel a stronger interest in the overthrow, than in the maintenance of the peace

and order of government—while here, on the contrary, every individual has a direct interest in its support. There is one remarkable difference between this country and the maritime powers of Europe. They possess colonies, the commerce of which they claim a right to monopolize, to the exclusion of American navigation, except as a matter of favour or concession, while the U. States, without colonies, have the superior advantage of an extensive yet compact territory, embracing all the varieties of soil and climate, with most of the productions of the temperate and torrid zones. Their distance moreover, secures to them all the benefits of an insular position, free from the dangers of too close a proximity to those who are now more powerful than themselves. This circumstance of situation, which has in latter times materially influenced and even determined the fate of many of the weaker powers, is impressively exemplified in the arrangements of the Congress of Vienna, and the important events now passing in regard to Holland, Belgium and Poland, as well as the constant struggle for the maintenance of the balance of power, wherewith the United States have heretofore avoided any connection. With a territory equal in extent to four-fifths of all Europe, comprising most of its productions, and those of its extensive colonies, with a common language, government and laws, encircled and intersected by the ocean, lakes and rivers affording a connected chain of inland navigation, this country is literally, as to all the benefits of agriculture, commerce and manufactures, a world within itself; and were Europe tomorrow sunk in the ocean by a convulsion of nature, these States would flourish with even accelerated rapidity, by the mere intrinsic force and influence of their own internal elements of prosperity. The contiguity of Mexico and the Canadas, the vicinity of South America and the West Indies, with a decided superiority over them all in wealth and intelligence, place their destinies in the hands of the United States, whose distance from the Old World renders their navy powerful, in proportion to that distance, for all the purposes of defence at home, or annoyance abroad. It is an ominous presage in regard to the future prospects of this hemisphere, that it is equal in size to about one third of the habitable globe, is the richest in its productions, and more capable of sustaining a numerous population than Europe and Africa combined, and that the population of the United States, progressing in the ratio of $33\frac{1}{3}$ *per cent.*, as it has done every ten years since 1790, will in twenty years be twenty-two millions, in forty years, thirty-nine millions, and in sixty years will reach the amazing number of seventy millions.

It is a remarkable feature, which greatly fortifies the pretentions of the United States to future greatness among the powers of the earth, that they embrace within themselves all the substantial elements of a *separate and independent political existence.* No other country combines all these advantages within its metropolitan limits. Here, cotton, sugar, rice, wool, flax, hemp, hides, iron, zinc, lead, copper, and coal, and even gold, abound, beside all the grains, roots, vegetables and woods of Europe, with many others peculiar to this region. Salt and saltpetre, now extensively made, with indigo, and raw silk,* the olive and vine, may be add-

* Great Britain consumes raw silk annually, of the value of $17,000,000, and France double that sum.

ed to the list, whenever the necessary stimulants are applied to their production and propagation.

It is a consideration of vital importance to this country, that nations whose exports consist almost exclusively of rude materials, and which have no manufactures, must not only remain dependent on others for many of the necessaries and even comforts of life, but forego all the advantage of multiplying their value by machinery, and of a profitable exchange and commerce with other countries, especially with that portion of the world which is yet their inferior in point of skill, ingenuity, and knowledge of the mechanic arts. Such is, in some respects, the condition of the United States. It is moreover notorious, that a determined and unrelenting spirit of monopoly and exclusion from its colonies, had been originally engrafted on the commercial system of Europe, and has since continued to signalize its measures and conduct. Great Britain, especially, had early taken decisive ground, and having wrested the trident from Holland in the war of 1652, the island of Jamaica from Spain, and subsequently the Canadas from France, and thus being mistress of all North America, except Louisiana, she extended her rigorous interdicts even to her own infant colonies, and prohibited their making any article which her own workshops could supply. Even the cattle and salt provisions of Ireland were not allowed to be carried to England. Her legal enactments abound with proofs of an illiberal spirit which sullied all her measures, and finally compelled this country to deny her constitutional right of taxation without representation, and to break the chains of its colonial vassalage.

The want of power and utter incompetency of Congress, under the old confederation of 1778, to regulate commerce with foreign nations and beween the States by a uniform system of revenue, and a tariff of duties for the purpose of defence and the protection of domestic industry and the shipping interest, was felt severely on the return of peace with Great Britain in 1783. Although the States *enjoyed free trade* and uninterrupted foreign intercourse, as respected the mere *prirlege* of importing goods and buying in the *cheapest* market, they were notwithstanding going rapidly to decay, and tending towards dissolution. The Government could neither countervail the injurious restrictions of nor treat for terms of reciprocity with foreign powers—they had no equivalent to offer—nothing to concede in return for the privilege of trading with the ports of Europe and its colonies. In this condition of affairs, after a fruitless experiment of three years, a Convention of consultation assembled at Annapolis in 1786, where the seeds of the present constitution were sown, which soon resulted in its successful establishment, and laid the foundation of the protective system in the tonnage and impost acts of 1789. From that period till the year 1793, a prosperous and increasing commerce, springing from the simultaneous occurrence of the war of the French revolution and of the new Constitution, raised the tonnage of the United States from 205,000 tons, in 1789, to 627,000, in 1793; but England, jealous of the prosperity of its *enfranchised colonies*, aimed a blow at their navigation by her orders in council of the latter year, which swept it from the ocean, and eventuated in the treaty of '94, granting partial indemnity for her past spoliations. France next took umbrage at the reconciliation with her enemy, which gradually ripened into partial hostilities; but scarcely was

this wound healed, when both belligerents sought fresh pretexts for insulting and violating the American flag—for although the United States enjoyed, on the whole, a highly lucrative trade from that time down to 1806, yet it was insecure, and in a constant state of jeopardy as the premiums of insurance sufficiently prove throughout the entire period. Finally, the affair of the Chesapeake and the virtual blockade of the coast by British cruizers, aggravated by insult and blood, followed by the orders in council, and Berlin and Milan decrees, produced the embargo, non-intercourse and non-importation measures, which finally resulted in hostilities with Great Britain. On the return of peace in 1815, a more determined policy of protection of manufactures, (the want of which, during the war, had been severely felt) was commenced in 1816, and subsequently confirmed by the acts of 1824 and 1828.

Your committee here resume the course of their explanatory remarks. In the rise and progress of Great Britain herself, originally a Roman colony, afterwards conquered alternately by the Saxons, Danes and Normans, we behold the phenomenon of a nation advancing through all the subordinate grades of civilization, to the loftiest eminence of power and dominion.—She now presents the most extraordinary instance of productive industry in every department of labour, of which the world furnishes any example, all the result of protection. To comprehend her system in all its aspects, is perhaps the most instructive lesson that history affords, to either the statesman or philosopher. With institutions, learning, private virtue, and constitutional freedom, which furnish altogether the best model of human greatness, that the most refined and polished ages can boast, yet is she at this moment so excited and convulsed by attempts to reform the abuses of her complicated political system, as to involve the issue of the conflict in great doubt and uncertainty. If wars of ambition, conquest, and monopoly, in Europe, have led to oppressive taxes, public debts, and all the train of evils that are now undermining its institutions, will the American people consent to contribute and pay a quota of those expenses? Such, however, would be the effect of not countervailing the restrictions and prohibitions of other nations—of refusing full protection to domestic industry!

The colonial system meanwhile is fast crumbling to atoms—Spain and Portugal have lost their most important possessions—St. Domingo is independent—the Canadas will in time probably follow our example—the British West Indies, deprived, by the regulations of the mother country, of a cheap supply of provisions and lumber, have become almost valueless—British India, more remote, is temporarily secure, but will ultimately shake off its allegiance. The tendency of all these changes is highly advantageous to the United States, by giving greater scope to their commercial and manufacturing operations. The governments of the continent are intent on protecting and encouraging their own industry, as essential to their existence; while Great Britain, whose prosperity, and power have hitherto been sustained, as regards her external relations, by a monopoly of the supply of others with her fabrics, fostered by her maritime ascendancy, now begins to experience a decline; that is, numerous competitors, and this country among the number, claim the privilege of supplying themselves, as well as a share of the business and profit of the trade of the world. In its present condition, no nation can possess a permanent & lucrative

commerce unless based essentially upon manfactures, and it is equally true, that the countries whose exports are confined to raw materials, are generally poor. The examples of Spain, Portugal, Russia, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, and Turkey, amply justify this assertion.—Who are the real receivers of the precious metals, and have been so for more than a century? Not the owners of the mines, surely, but Great Britain and France, who have paid for them with their fabrics, extensively introduced into the mining regions. To the question—have these countries been enriched by that traffic, or has their industry been smothered in the embraces of the mistress of the seas? Their poverty furnishes an impressive answer. Let the United States take warning from these fatal examples. If the stupendous capital and resources of Great Britain are not the offspring of the principle of protection and encouragement of her internal industry, the effect of which is seen in the application of the steam engine to labor-saving machinery, whence are they derived or what nourishes and sustains her agriculture and wide-spread commerce? It is well known that the astonishing discoveries and improvements made within the last half century, have effected an entire revolution in the productive powers of labour. The mind of man has penetrated and analyzed the long concealed properties of matter. In the arts of peace as in the science of war, genius, skill, and intellect, command success, when and wherever they have chosen to assert their sway. A wise and provident government, by rewarding and protecting the meritorious efforts and exertions of its people, can awaken and direct at pleasure, its energies and enterprise, and teach it to triumph over obstacles formerly deemed insurmountable. Identity of language and habits with the great and powerful nation from which we sprang, has rendered its knowledge and experience common property for every practical and useful purpose, and both its skill and capital domesticate themselves among us, almost as naturally as in their native soil. The manifest tendency of the whole protective policy is to augment the inducements to emigrate to the United States, for just in proportion to the reduction in the price of goods in England, and difficulty of selling, from the operation of our Tariff, is the motive strengthened for removing hither. Its repeal would therefore produce the double injury of crippling the infant establishments of this country, and of preventing the transfer of theirs.

Although your committee have extended their remarks further than they at first intended, yet the great interests involved in the subject embolden them to trespass somewhat longer on the patience of the convention. The philanthropic theory of free trade can only rest on a pre-supposed equality and reciprocity of benefits in the intercourse between nations, and the opinion that man, if left to himself, knows best how to take care of his own interest. If this principle however is analysed, it will be found as difficult of execution as it is unphilosophical in reference to human nature. In a civilized state man gives up a portion of his liberty the better to secure the remainder—but why restrict liberty and not regulate his conduct in the social compact? Why leave his great and vital interests to shift for themselves, and struggle against rivals who are constantly plotting their ruin? Why guard and cherish the liberty of the subject, and leave his labour unprotected? the duty of government towards both, is equally imperative and obligatory. Where both are thoroughly secured, there

will they establish their dominion, and exert their influence for the benefit of man; where either is neglected both will perish, for the end and object of liberty is security to life and property—it is to feed, clothe and shelter the people.—Not to protect your own industry, is virtually to abandon and subject it to the tyranny and control of foreign nations. The exertions of each to promote and stimulate the energies and enterprise of its inhabitants, augments production, and causes the greatest aggregate prosperity. If the weaker nations neglect this duty, they confer in reality a monopoly on the strongest, who, in that event, impose their own terms and conditions. Each government can enjoy free trade, equality and reciprocity within its own jurisdiction, so far as qualified liberty will allow. The constitution of the United States for instance, provides that all taxes and impost duties shall be uniform throughout the States; but this uniform principle is totally inapplicable to nations in their intercourse with each other, because universal consent and submission to the rule can never be obtained.—but its impracticability as well as its impolicy is demonstrable on other grounds. Nations, like men, have their periods of youth, maturity and old age, and the same unbending rule is no more applicable to every stage of their advancement, than a particular food and raiment to the different periods of human life. An old *manufacturing* country like England, and a young *agricultural* one like the United States, in its colonial condition, derive mutual benefit from the interchange of the products of their industry—their wants are different, and their traffic reciprocally convenient. In like manner England and her colony of New Holland exchange to mutual advantage, they are both gainers, but this will not continue, New Holland, like the United States, will improve—new interests and wants will spring up as she advances, and she will finally manufacture for herself, and covet independence. Old nations, on the contrary, circumstanced as France and England, have little to gain from each other. They are now friends, but unable to agree on the terms of a treaty of commerce. The French minister lately told the British ambassador that the theory of free trade was very good, but as France was behind England in capital, skill and machinery, there was no equality in it *at present*, but it might perhaps suit them fifty years hence. So the negociation proved abortive.

As between the United States and Great Britain the case is nearly the same—fifty years hence, the United States will number fifty-three millions of souls and will then be able to compete with her on even terms. At present England wishes to exchange the labour of her *machinery* against American *manual* labour, being in the ratio of its productive powers more than two hundred to one against the United States. This country can, however, exchange advantageously with Spain, Portugal, and their former American colonies. They are all yet in a comparative state of infancy as to the progress of industry, manufactures and the mechanic arts, so that both parties will gain by the intercourse.

England (says Mr. Robertson in a late speech in parliament,) derives more benefit from her exports of manufactures to Portugal with its two and a half millions of people, than from all her trade with France, Denmark, Sweden and Norway with their forty-five millions united, and supplies her with nearly all her cod-fish at fifteen per cent. duty, while the United States pay thirty per cent. This inequality resembles the exclusion of

lumber and staves from this country by a prohibitory duty, while these articles from Canada are freely admitted, both into the British ports and West India colonies. The American government is, however, endeavouring to effect a reduction of the duty on fish by a treaty with Portugal, and may succeed if not prevented by British interference. The plain solution of the friendship of Great Britain for that wretched country is, that she levies five dollars per head on its aggregate population in exchange for annual supply of manufactures and salt fish, and receives payment in some wine and fruit and the balance in specie. Mr. Robertson went on to state "that it was idle to endeavour to persuade other nations to join them in adopting the principles of what was called free-trade—they knew that free trade meant nothing more nor less, than by means of the great advantages Great Britain enjoyed, to get a monopoly of all the markets for their manufactures, and prevent them one and all from becoming manufacturing nations."

Chaptal remarks, that the long wars of Europe have taught nations to cultivate their internal resources, and rely less on foreign supply and consumption. A temporary sacrifice in order to secure the acquisition of a valuable manufacture, is as wise and prudent as to expend a few years labour in bringing a farm under proper cultivation with a view to future profit, or to plant an orchard, a nursery or a forest, which is to yield remote benefit. The coincidence of natural and artificial advantages has never before been so strikingly marked as in the United States. The great agents in manufacturing operations of fire and water, with the most important raw materials and unrivalled mechanical genius, are here concentrated, and constitute, as your committee believe, an anomalous case in history. Here moreover, man labours for his own benefit, is lord paramount of the soil he cultivates—is at once *sovereign and subject*, the governing and the governed—a principle which imparts an elastic energy to the mind, known only in this land of liberty. If knowledge is power, then also is it a more efficient capital than the mere precious metals can supply. It germinates in the mind. *Home industry* is most emphatically the *patent right*, the *exclusive privilege* of every country, but peculiarly so of the American People—it is the very essence and vitality of wealth and power, and let it never be forgotten, of morality and happiness likewise. With a judicious system of roads and canals, it becomes the surest pledge of union and independence.—the sacred link which holds the states together by the ties of one common interest. As well might government infringe and violate the vested right that every man holds in his own invention and discoveries, as permit the interference of *foreign* with *domestic* labour, identified as that *foreign labour* is, with the creations of *machinery* constantly working in its exchanges against the *manual* production of raw materials in this country.

In conclusion. As the final extinguishment of the public debt will necessarily lead to a reduction of the revenue with a view of accomodating it to the diminished expenditure of the country, much caution will be required to effect it in such manner as not to lessen the security which it has been the constant policy of government to afford to domestic industry. The cotton and sugar planters, the wool growers and the Iron masters have been adequately protected, as well by the duties originally imposed on the raw material, as on the foreign manufactures made therefrom,

but your committee are not aware that any thing has been done for the great grain growing region of the United States, as both justice and an enlarged policy would seem to demand. Rice finds a market at all times in Europe, but wheat, corn and flour, are virtually prohibited.

In submitting the annexed schedule of duties, which might not only be repealed without injury to domestic industry, but even beneficially as regards commerce and navigation, they have added the amount of duties which accrued in 1828 on spirits of all kinds, whether made from grain or other materials. Should Congress deem it expedient to raise the duty on the last mentioned article to the rate now payable in Great Britain, (that is five dollars per gall.) it would be nearly prohibitory, though not so much so as to preclude the opulent and luxurious from indulging in the use of it. Even England levies 8s. 6d. sterling per gallon on rum from her American colonies, and 20s. sterling from the East Indies, a striking evidence of the wisdom of that government in protecting her own grain, with the double view to its consumption by distillation, and in brewing malt liquors. With such admonition, will this country do less for the cultivators of its own soil, and leave them dependent for a sale of their grain on the precarious and uncertain demands of foreign nations? Your committee would further remark, that if a repeal of the duties on wines, fruits, olive-oil, and silks, should be decided on by government, an opportunity would be afforded for obtaining some corresponding relaxation and benefit by negociation from France, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia and Italy, which produce these articles.

Sweet or olive oil is the basis of the finest soaps, and its exemption from duty would therefore aid an important manufacture, and not interfere with the fish and other oils of this country.

All which is respectfully submitted.

STATEMENT exhibiting the amount of duties which accrued on the following articles betwen 30th September 1830, deducting what was exported, and showing the probable annual consumption.

N. B. As the partial repeal of the duties on Tea and Coffee, did not take effect till after September 1830, it does not reduce this estimate.

		Duty		
Silks from India	$1,000.000	36 per ct.	$360.000	
other places	4,000,000	22	880.000	
Watches and parts of Watches	310,000	12½	38,750	
Pearls, precious Stones, &c.	65.000	"	8,125	
Tin in Plates	361.000	15	54,150	
Opium	37.000	"	5.550	
Raw Silk	10,000	"	1 500	
				1,348,075
	Gall.	Duty		
Wines—Madeira	166,000	50 cts.	117 250	
Sherry	48 500			
Red, France and Spain not enumerated	1,110,000	10	111,000	
	1,180,000	15	177,000	
Sicily and other countries not enumerated	300,000	30	90,000	
				495,250
		Carried over,		$1,843,325

Brought over				$1.843,325
	Pounds	Duty		
Teas—Bohea	149,000	12 cts.	17,880	
Souchong	1,676,000	25	419,000	
Hyson Skin and other green	1,685,000	28	471,800	
Hyson and Young Hyson	3,140,000	40	1,256,000	
Imperial	280,000	50	140,000	
				2,304,680
	Pounds	Duty		
Coffee	38,500,000	5 cts.	1,925,000	
Cocoa	1,000,000	2	20,000	
Almonds, Currants, Prunes, Figs,	3,160,000	3	94,800	
Raisins in Jars	3.260,000	4	130,400	
other	2,700,000	3	81,000	
				2,251,200
	Pounds	Duty		
Spices—Ginger	2,000	2	40	
Nutmegs	54,250	60	32,550	
Cinnamon	4,000	25	1,000	
Cloves	38,000	25	9,500	
Black Pepper	1,100,000	8	88,000	
Pimento	1,340,000	6	80,400	
Cassia	100,000	6	6 000	
Books not English, Latin or Greek	90,000 vls	4	3,600	
				221,090
		Duty		
Brass in Plates	$10,608	25 per et.	$2,652	
Saltpetre, crude,	32,214	12½	4,027	
Camphor,	107,000 lbs.	8 cts. per lb.	8,560	
				15,539
Olive oil yielded in 1828				39,477
Bristles, do do				10,727
Vinegar of Wine, do				3,162
				$6,689 200
The quantity of Spirits of all kinds whether made of grain or other materials was 4,446,698 galls., the duty on which at 50 19-100 cts. was				2,231,847
				$8,921,047

N. B. Indigo in 1828 produced on 1,084,491 pounds at 15 per cent. ad valorem a duty of $162,673, but as it will next year pay the full duty of 50 cts. per pound, which will fall principally on the manufacturing interest, its continuance, unless the Southern States intend to undertake its cultivation, presents an interesting question of policy in which the feelings and wishes of the South ought to be consulted.

If desirable, a reduction of the postage would further lessen the revenue.

REPORT ON CHEMISTRY.

At a general convention of the friends of domestic industry, assembled at New York, Oct. 26th, 1831. In convention, October 28th, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to report on the subject of Chemistry, as connected with the Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts.

Messrs. *Isaac Tyson, Jr.* and *Christian Keener*, of Maryland; *William Parmenter*, of Massachusetts; *Edward Roberts* and *Thomas Bakewell*, of Pennsylvania, were accordingly appointed; and, through their Chairman, beg leave to present the following

REPORT:

The committee, in discharge of the duties assigned them, report that chemistry, as connected with the business of life, may be considered a modern science. Its early history gives it rather the character of an occult art, associated with the visionary theories of the alchemist. And for a long period, it was signalized neither by usefulness nor by dignity. Finally, however, the improved state of society, and the progress of civilization, excited the genius of a few, who, by a series of brilliant discoveries, astonished the world; and, by the application of these to manufactures and the arts, administered to the comfort and the necessities of mankind. Though long taught in the schools as a science, it is only a short period since the United States were dependent on foreign countries for every article in this interesting and important department of manufactures.

Intimately connected with science and the healing art, and essential to other manufactures, chemistry received very little or no attention from the enterprise and skill of our country, until the late war. That event suddenly cut off the usual supplies from foreign countries. The consequent advance in price was excessive, and the inconvenience sustained by that class of manufacturers who consumed chemicals, incalculable. This state of things gave the first impulse to chemistry in our country.

The return of peace, however, brought foreign competition, which soon threatened to extinguish the infant and yet inexperienced establishments which had crept into existence during the war. The large importations which, at that period, inundated the country, caused a reduction in prices, alike ruinous to the importer and his competitor, the American manufacturer.

This depression, however, would have been but temporary, had there been no interference on the part of the government. The foreigner would have prevailed in the contest—and the market becoming *his*, the prices would have been in accordance with his own remorseless interests.

Happily for the nation, and more particularly for that numerous labouring class who are dependent on chemical manipulations,—and the agriculturists, who find in this class a customer instead of a rival;—happily also for the other classes of manufactures which owe their existence to chem-

istry, the tariff act of 1824 placed the *seal* upon the policy of the nation. By this act, and not until after its passage, was the manufacture of chemicals *established* in the United States.

Until it became the policy of the nation to encourage a domestic supply of chemicals, prices were constantly fluctuating—were generally high, and oftentimes seized upon for purposes of speculation, to the great injury of consumers. Domestic competition has caused prices to settle at a minimum rate. The manufacturer is now so near the consumer, that his wants are anticipated and scarcity is unknown—because the raw material, being unlimited in quantity, and individual enterprise commensurate with it, the demand is seldom allowed to overtake the supply. When alum was an article for import, the price was generally $7\frac{1}{2}$ dollars a cwt.

During the late war it rose to 18 cents per lb.

The price at present is about $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents per lb.

Copperas was subject to greater fluctuations, varying with the vacillating policy of the importer, or the foreign manufacturer, or the contrivance of the speculator:

The price was often 7 dollars the *cwt.* and sometimes below the cost of importation. During the war, it advanced to 17 cents per lb. It now sells for $2\frac{1}{4}$ cents per lb.

Epsom salts, which is one of the leading items in the chemical department, is an offspring of the tariff of 1824. And what is the result of this parental relation? A mineral which had remained for ages unnoticed and even unknown, was dug from hills previously considered barren and valueless, and, by an admirable process of chemistry, converted into magnesia and epsom salts, of a quality superior to the foreign. But the effect of a protective system is more clearly shewn by the following list of prices of epsom salts, at the different periods before and after the duty of four cents per lb. was imposed by the tariff of 1824.

In 1820, the price was	- -	11 to 12	cents per lb.
1823, - - - -	$7\frac{1}{4}$	"	"
1824, - - - - -	10	"	"
1826, - - - -	$7\frac{1}{2}$	"	"
1831, - - - - -	$3\frac{1}{2}$	"	"

Those who seriously contend that the duty on foreign merchandize is a tax on the consumer to the full amount of that duty, will here find a case difficult to reconcile with their theory: the present price of epsom salts being $3\frac{1}{2}$, whilst the duty is 4 cents per lb. Nor is this all—the improved manufacture and reduced price of epsom salts,* has very nearly excluded the use of the coarse and nauseous article, glauber salts; of which latter only a small quantity is at present made and consumed.

The usual price of refined saltpetre was about 13 cents per lb. before the tariff of 1824, when a duty of 3 cents per lb. was laid upon the foreign manufacture, which is its present price. The treasury tables for 1830, shew that only 80 dollars worth of it was imported.

Sulphuric acid was worth 7 cents per lb. previous to 1824—since only 3 and 4 cents.

The sulphate of quinine, when first manufactured, sold at an enormously high price; and its value in France was said to be two millions of dol-

*One of the numbers of the *London Mechanics' Magazine* for 1828, said—"The United States, which used to be furnished with epsom salts from this country, now have the whole supply from a manufactory established in Baltimore—making a *purer* salt than in Europe, and at *much less price.*"

lars a year. In 1828, it was worth from 7 to 8 dollars the *oz.* and its manufacture was soon after commenced in the United States. At the close of 1831, it was selling in Baltimore for $\$1\frac{1}{2}$ *per oz.* but has latterly advanced to $\$2\frac{3}{4}$, because of the increased cost of the material out of which it is made.

Many other articles shew a similar result, but the cases cited will sufficiently illustrate the principle contended for. It may be safely stated, that the general price of chemical articles is *one half less* than it was before the *establishment* of their manufacture by the protecting tariff of 1824. Hence it would appear that one million of dollars *per annum* have been saved to present consumers in the United States, by this new application of domestic industry, talent and capital; besides the employment and subsistence of a large number of persons, variously engaged in the laboratories, or furnishing materials; and the chief part of the latter would have remained, as they had been for ages, valueless—but on account of the encouragement and protection afforded.

The large consumption caused by the growing wants of our country, if dependent on the laboratories of Europe, would have either enhanced prices or have justified the maintenance of former rates;—for, until the business was undertaken in this country, the foreign manufacturers seem not to have discovered how cheap they could work.

The intimate connection between chemistry and the arts of dyeing, bleaching and calico printing; and their mutual dependence on each other, need not here be insisted on. The importance of the former cannot be duly estimated, without taking into view the various interests into which it diffuses itself.

The protection offered to several chemicals has not only reduced prices, but almost entirely excluded the foreign article. Indeed, as to alum and copperas, the exclusion seems complete,—for the treasury tables of 1830 do not shew that one pound of either was imported. The prices of many chemical articles are as low in this country as in Europe; but, nevertheless, your committee are of opinion that it would be unwise to repeal the existing duties, because experience indicates that the foreign competitor, from a disposition to get rid of his surplus stock, and with the less creditable design of strangling the growing establishments which have deprived him of a market, will crowd his productions upon us, regardless of the calculations which usually govern trade,—enduring the present loss with the hope of distant gain, which is to be the fruits of victory obtained in prostrating his rival.

The chemist asks to be protected from such an enemy. Your committee might further illustrate the principles they contend for, by a more detailed examination of the department referred to them; but in so doing they would extend this report to an unreasonable length, and multiply arguments on a question which, fortunately for the country, is already settled.

Besides the articles previously noticed, the chemical establishments of this country manufacture Calomel, and various other Mercurial preparations, Glauber Salts, Rochelle Salts, Tartar Emetic, Ammonia, Sulphate of Quinine, Oil of Vitriol, Tartaric Acid, Aqua Fortis, Prussian Blue, Chrome Yellow, Chrome Green, Nitric Acid, Muriatic Acid, Barrilla, Oxalic Acid, Chloride of Lime, Chloride of Soda, refined Saltpetre, refined Borax, refined Camphor, Acetic Acid, Acetate of Lead, Nitrate of Lead, Prussiate of Potash, Bi-chromate of Potash;—and the endless developements of the science of chemistry are almost daily adding to the list.

It is a highly interesting fact, that nearly all the materials used in chem-

ical establishments, are the produce of our country. Brimstone, saltpetre, quicksilver, cream tartar, and Peruvian bark, are the only material exceptions; and it happens, that our competitors, in manufacturing chemistry, are without domestic resources for these same excepted materials. Both draw their supplies from the same sources. Nor is the fact less interesting, that the articles used in chemical factories, other than the exceptions just alluded to, are generally of a character useless, and sometimes loathsome.

Clay is used in the manufacture of alum, iron ore and pyrites for copperas; a magnesian mineral for magnesia and epsom salts; copper ore, old copper, and the scales which occur in the manufacture of copper, for blue vitriol. The blood which flows from the slaughter-house, the horn shavings which are swept from the comb-maker's shop, and the trimmings and scraps of leather, which would otherwise encumber the currier, are all converted into Prussian blue, the prussiate of potash and ammonia.

Even the atmosphere we breathe is made subservient to the cause, and is converted into merchandise by its combination with brimstone, in the formation of oil of vitriol and other chemicals.

Your committee, believing that a more particular allusion to a few facts may be useful in causing the subject of chemistry to be appreciated, take the occasion to state, that chrome yellow, as a pigment in common use, may be said to be the result of American chemistry. It was originally discovered native in the Uralian mountains, and sold for its weight in gold. It was first made artificially in France, by Vauquelin, from the chromate of iron, discovered in small quantities in the department of Var, in 1797. The chromate of iron having been discovered in considerable quantities near Baltimore, in the state of Maryland, extensive works were erected for manufacturing it into chrome yellow. The price was first three dollars per lb.—but domestic competition, and improvements in the process, have caused a gradual decline to 35 cents per lb.

Some years ago the chemists of the United States exported chrome yellow to England, and, for a short time, fancied that a valuable market was opened to them; for the British tariff had not provided for this new article.

But the British manufacturer, finding his protection thus encroached on, applied to the *board of trade* for relief, and an *order in council* was immediately passed, subjecting foreign chrome yellow to a duty so high as to be prohibitory.

An act of parliament was too tedious a process to give relief to a British manufacturer, subject to the competition of an American manufacturer. "Free Trade" was no more the policy of England then, than it is her practice now.

A further evidence of the great resources of this country, as developed by chemistry, is found in the existence of vast masses of alum and copperas ore on the Chesapeake Bay, near Baltimore.

In searching for bituminous coal, of which there are strong indications, this mineral was brought to light. It consists of partially decomposed vegetable matter, with clay and sand and iron pyrites distributed through the mass, and the whole covered with a bed of iron pyrites.

This mineral, dug and exposed to the atmosphere, undergoes a spontaneous combustion, and gives rise to the formation of sulphate of alumine and iron, which, lixiviated, only requires evaporation and chrystalization.

Preparations are now being made in Baltimore for manufacturing, from this mineral, alum and copperas to an extent fully adequate to the wants of the community.

Beds of iron pyrites also exist of great extent in the towns of Strafford and Shrewsbury, Vermont,—from which the country east of the Alleghany mountains has been principally supplied with copperas for many years. They are worked by two incorporated companies, manufacture 2,500,000 lbs. per annum, employ 75 men, consume 3000 cords wood, pay for transportation by wagons, canal, river-craft and coasting vessels, $20,000—using considerable quantities of lead, iron and gunpowder.

In the neighbourhood of Liberty, in Frederick county, Maryland, there exists a copper ore, which, besides being adapted to yielding metallic copper, is, by a slight chemical treatment, converted into blue vitriol.

But it would swell this report beyond its proper limits were your committee to give in detail the history and resources of the manufactures of this country. They are able to enumerate thirty chemical establishments in the United States. The capital invested in these concerns, according to the best estimate that can be made, is 1,158,000 dollars. The value of the articles produced may safely be put down at one million of dollars, and the number of hands employed at 900, and the number dependent on them for support 4000. Nearly the whole value of chemicals is paid in labour and fuel—the cost of most of the materials used being inconsiderable.

Pot and pearl ashes enter into the composition of many chemicals—giving a home market for a large quantity of the product of the forest.

Almost every chemical process requires the aid of heat. Immense quantities of fuel are consequently consumed in the laboratories. One establishment in Baltimore requires 4000 cords of wood per annum, besides considerable quantities of anthracite and bituminous coal.

The total value of fuel consumed in chemical operations in this country is estimated at 120,000 dollars. The benefit accruing to the landed interest, by reason of this great demand on the forests and mines, and the employment given to the labouring class, in cutting the wood and mining the coal, and in transporting both to these new markets, cannot but be appreciated by all reflecting persons.

The smelters of the lead of our own mines in the far west, here find an important ally. Large quantities of this metal are used in the construction of chemical works, and some is consumed in the manipulations. But your committee forbear to trespass upon the duties of the committee appointed on lead and its manufactures.

Your committee have no accurate *data* by which they can learn the quantity of tonnage employed in transporting the materials used, and the chemicals manufactured from them.

The sulphur, from the volcanic mountains of ancient Sicily—the quicksilver from Spain—the saltpetre from the East Indies—and the Peruvian bark from South America—form considerable items in our foreign trade, and give no small employment to the shipping interest. But it is the coasting trade that receives the chief benefit.

The chemical establishments are few, compared with the number of their customers—and their goods are consequently distributed along the whole line of our coast.

Should any change be made in the existing tariff, your committee would suggest some amendments which the new developements of the science have made necessary.

Sulphate of quinine is manufactured from the Peruvian bark, and promotes the important trade with the Pacific.

The consumption in the United States is, in part, supplied by the chemists of France, the duty being only 15 per cent. If the duty on sulphate of

quinine were increased, and the bark from which it is extracted admitted free of any duty, the entire consumption would be derived from our own laboratories, and the increased trade with Peru would greatly benefit the commercial interest. Instead of importing the quinine in its small bulk, not appreciable as a freight, and by a short voyage, and from a country that excludes almost every thing American, cotton excepted—we would, on the other hand, receive from distant Peru the more bulky bark—paying for it in household furniture and various other American manufactures, and even in the quinine itself, extracted from the material.

Saltpetre is one of the most costly articles used by the manufacturing chemist. Small quantities of very inferior quality, are found in the limestone caves of the western states; but the crude material is limited, and the refining process costly—therefore few are disposed to engage in that business, and these few on a very small scale. There is no interest in this country to be benefitted by a duty on saltpetre.

Your committee are of opinion that the following articles might safely be admitted free of duty. Some of them, if not strictly within the sphere of the present inquiry, indirectly belong to it:—Peruvian Bark; Crude Saltpetre; Nitrate of Soda; Quicksilver; Crude Borax; Crude Camphor; Cream Tartar; Galls; Gum Arabic; Gum Senegal; Gum Copal; Gum Tragacanth; Gum Shellac; Platina; Caoutchouc.

The time and the occasion is suitable to suggest, that many foreign chemicals are only charged with the small duty levied on articles not enumerated in the tariff. Such of them as interfere with the establishments of this country, or such as would be produced with a suitable patronage from the government, ought to bear a heavier duty—and such as are not adapted to our climate or resources, might be declared free of duty.

And, as there is always a strong temptation, by disguising them under a name not found in the law, in order to bring them under the *ad valorem* duty of 15 per ct. (that being the duty of non-enumerated articles,) it would be expedient to make all non-enumerated chemicals subject to a much heavier duty. Every article would then come in review before the country, and each would be either made free of duty, or be assigned to its proper place in the scale. And specific duties, the committee think, should be always preferred to the ad valorem, if practicable.

Having already named the articles which may, without interfering with any domestic manufacturing interest, be exempted from all duty on their importation, it now becomes proper to furnish a list of such as require further legislation, to relieve the country from an unnecessary dependence on foreigners, as follows:—Sulphate of Quinine; Carbonate of Magnesia; Sugar of Lead; Nitrate of Lead; Acetate of Iron; Roll Brimstone; All the preparations of Mercury; Sal Amoniac; Rochell Salts; Soda; Solutions of Tin; Verdegris; Tartar Emetic; Chromate of Potash; Bi-chromate of Potash; Chloride of Lime, Chloride of Soda; Tartaric Acid; Chrome Yellow; Prussian Blue; Prussiate of Potash; Barilla; Soda; Carbonate of Soda; Magnesia.

If congress should determine to abolish the duties on imported articles, not coming into competition with similar articles made or produced within the United States, the labour of the officers of the customs would be much diminished—and it is respectfully suggested, whether the contemplated law ought not to require these officers to keep a particular and *separate* account, accessible to the public, at each custom house, of the quantity and value of all merchandize imported, whether free of duty or subject to specific or ad valorem duties? The statistical information thus

obtained would be of great importance to the manufacturing chemist, as well as to every other class of persons. The law might, with great propriety, also provide for a more prompt diffusion of the information thus obtained. Statistical facts are valuable in proportion to the promptness with which they are known. When delayed, they are more a matter of curiosity than of practical usefulness.

A well organized system of statistics would not only be a guide to the statesman, enabling him to legislate on the intricate subject of trade understandingly, but it would inform the merchant on the important matter of consumption and supply, and save him from the many errors into which he is liable to be led, by reason of his unavoidable ignorance in this particular. Such intelligence often, and promptly, communicated, would, in a great measure, prevent the occurrence of that scarcity and consequent enhancement of price, which so frequently takes the consumer by surprise: and on the other hand, would guard against that excessive glut and consequent ruinous reduction of prices, which have done more to involve the enterprising merchant and injure the manufacturer, than all the foreign competition that can be combined against them.

On behalf of the Committee,

ISAAC TYSON, Jun. *Chairman.*

THE WHALE FISHERY.

The following communication forwarded to the chairman of the permanent committee by the member to whom it was addressed, was laid before the executive committee, and ordered to be published.

H. NILES, *Chairman.*

Boston, Nov. 11, 1831.

SIR :—I noticed among the statements made to the tariff convention recently held in New York, that every branch of American Industry was protected, with but few exceptions; and among these exceptions the *fisheries* were mentioned. This would appear to be the case to most persons—but to a practical man, who is connected with the business, and has looked to the continuance of the *indirect* protection with deep solicitude, (so far as regards the whale fishery,) it appears quite the contrary; and from the following statements it will be made manifest, that, if the cotton and woollen factories are not sustained by an adequate protection, a large proportion of the ships engaged in the sperm whale fishery must go out of employment, or be thrown upon the freighting business—thus destroying a vast nursery of seamen, and, at the same time, creating a ruinous competition in a branch of industry already represented, by many who are engaged in it, as not worth pursuing. It is a well established fact, that from one-fourth to one-third of all the sperm oil imported, is used in the factories of cotton and woollen goods—averaging about half a gallon to each cotton and woollen spindle; besides what is used by the numerous mechanics connected with factories. By the statement herewith handed, you will perceive the vast increase in the importation of sperm oil since 1815; and the continued increase or diminution is entirely dependent on the protection afforded to the manufacturers of the country, and the duty now existing on the importation of *olive oil.* Of the last mentioned oil, considerable quantities are used in the woollen factories, giving employment to a considerable amount of tonnage—which quantity, no doubt, would be much increased if the duty were taken off: but this reduction of duty on olive oil would be very fatal to a considerable portion of the interest engaged in that valuable branch of domestic industry, the sperm whale fishery,—supposing that protection to the woollen manufacture is continued. If, however, that protection be withdrawn, the duty on olive oil may as well be removed as not, as but

little will be wanted in the country, (excepting sallad oil) and the law will be a dead letter. To give you an idea of the value of the protecting laws to the ship builders, rope makers, sail makers, coopers, coasting trade, farmers, &c., as well as to the country generally, I herewith furnish you with some of the principal articles which are used by the present fleet of three hundred ships, as often as they are fitted for sea.—viz:

36,000 barrels of flour,
30,000 barrels of beef and pork,
18,000 bolts of duck,
3,000 tons of iron hoops,
6,000,000 staves,
2,000 tons cordage and whale warp,

with large quantities of Iron for harpoons, lances, spades, blubber-hooks and camboose grates; much molasses, rice, beans, peas, corn, tea, coffee, sugar, &c. *and not less than 6,500 officers and men to man the ships.* These ships give more employment to mechanics, of various descriptions,—I should think twice as much, as the same number of tons engaged in any other trade. The sperm oil ships require to be coppered every voyage, and the quantity of copper consumed by the 300 ships will average annually 700,000 pounds, which, with the nails used to put it on, will be equal to three quarters of a million pounds, annually. The quantity of sperm oil imported for 1815 was 3,944 bbls. of 31½ gallons each.

1816	7,539	1821	48,000	1826	32,840
1817	32,650	1822	42,000	1827	93,150
1818	18,625	1823	87,250	1828	73,077
1819	21,323	1824	92,380	1829	79,340
1820	34,708	1825	62,240	1830	106,229

and, for 1831, the import of sperm oil will be about one hundred and ten thousand barrels, and the consumption is equal to the supply: ninety-seven thousand barrels have already arrived. The quantity of the common whale oil, annually imported, has been about equal to the import of sperm oil, till this year, when it will exceed that of sperm oil. The whale oil already imported, since Jan. 1, 1831, is one hundred and twelve thousand barrels, and there probably will be a further import of 5 or 6 thousand barrels before the 31st December 1831. The whale oil is chiefly exported to Europe, as well as the whale bone—the latter amounting to over one thousand pounds. This article is taken exclusively from the common or black whale. The sperm oil is consumed within the United States, as no other country excepting Great Britain, makes much use of it—and she, by her protective laws, excludes the sperm oil from this country by a duty of about 45 cts. on the gallon. But for such duty we should drive the British from the whale fishery, [generally] notwithstanding the bounty paid by their government for its protection. We should also destroy the French fisuery, but for like protection afforded by the French government, in duties and bounties.

The United States is the only government where the people are extensively engaged in the whale fishery which does not encourage this branch of industry by a bounty!

I have not been able to condense my remarks on this very important subject, within a narrower compass. It is a branch of great magnitude in a national point of view; but, I regret to say, that it is very imperfectly understood. It is a better nursery for seamen than any other; as almost every ship carries out from 5 to 10 green hands—whereas, in the merchant service, the ships carry so few men that they are necessarily obliged to take able bodied seamen, to the exclusion of green hands.

Yours, very respectfully,

C. W. CARTWRIGHT.

The quantity of sperm candles, manufactured from 100,000 bbls. sperm oil, is rising two and a half millions of pounds. This part of the business came near escaping my recollection. C. W. C.

The chairman of the permanent committee takes leave to add a few particulars and remarks:

Great Britain allows a bounty of one pound per tun on every vessel that shall proceed and return from the whale fishery in the Greenland sea or Davis Straits, or the seas adjacent.

Special bounties, some as high as six hundred pounds on a vessel, engaged in the southern, or sperm whale fishery, and bringing home not less than 30 tons of oil, or head matter, have been allowed. The details are too extensive for insertion—but the preceding shows the spirit of the British laws, as to *bounties* on the whale fisheries.

The *protection* is in the duties imposed on oil. Train oil, &c. if imported in British vessels *owned in Europe*, and navigated according to law, pays a duty of 5*s.* per tun of 252 galls.—if in vessels owned in certain plantations, from 13*s.* 4*d.* to 5*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.*—per tun—but if the product of *foreign fishing*, 22*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.* per tun. And on sperm oil, there is paid on the first class of British vessels, 8*s.* 3*d.* per tun, and, if of foreign fishing, 34*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.* per tun. So that the British market is completely shut against American competition. There is no doubt, if the trade were *free*, that no British ship would be employed in the whale fishery. The industry and perseverance, economy and skill of our fishermen, is without rivalry.

Another gentleman computes the annual product of our whale fishery at 3,500,000 dollars, and the value of the ships at $7,500,000.

The importance of this employment, as a nursery for seamen, may be partially conjectured from the fact—(communicated soon after the event by a distinguished officer of the navy,) that among the crew of the Constitution frigate, when she captured the Cyane and Levant, were more than *two hundred freeholders.* They had been fishermen, and the matter stated shows the character of this people.

The communication of Mr. Cartwright passed to the permanent committee through the hands of a woollen manufacturer. He says that he uses 4000 gallons of olive oil annually, and that, if the duty on that article be a tax, he would save $1000 a year by taking it off. But he regards such duty as indispensable to the success of the whale fishery, and will not agree to abandon it.

But, if the writer of these additional remarks is not misinformed by those who ought to know all the facts, (and he hopes to shew them by references to prices current, at a future period,) the price of olive oil has always advanced or declined with the price of sperm oil: the *competition* of the latter having the usual tendency of *increased supply*, to keep down the cost of the former.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURES OF COTTON.

At the convention of the Friends of American Industry, held in New-York, in October last, a committee was appointed to obtain information and report on the production and manufacture of Cotton.

This committee was organized by the appointment of *P. T. Jackson* as Chairman, and of the following sub-committees, who were requested to make returns, as early as possible, to the chairman, of such facts and information as they should obtain on the subjects submitted by the convention.

For Maine and New-Hampshire, *Lloyd W. Wells* and *John Williams.*

For Massachusetts and Vermont, *Robert Rogerson* and *P. T. Jackson.*

For Rhode-Island, *James D'Wolf*, *James F. Simmons* and *Charles Jackson.*

For Connecticut, *J. H. De Forest.*

For New-York, *E. B. Shearman*, *James Wild*, and *Richard P. Hart.*

For New-Jersey, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, &c. *Daniel Holsman* and *Mark W. Collett.*

For Pennsylvania, Delaware and Tennessee, *Lewis Waln* and *Alexander Brackenridge.*

For Maryland and Virginia, *Columbus O'Donnell & James W. Mc Culloh.*

From the returns made by these several Committees, the annexed Report is made up, and is respectfully submitted.

P. T. JACKSON, *Chairman.*

Boston, Feb. 11, 1832.

REPORT.

The committee, to whom was referred the subject of the production and manufacture of cotton, have collected, by the aid of members of their body in the several states, the details which are submitted in the statements annexed. Circulars were addressed to every establishment within the knowledge of the committee, and from their replies the facts contained in their statements have been abstracted. It will be perceived, that information, collected in this manner, must command more implicit confidence than any estimates, but that it is liable to important omissions. Such are in this instance known to exist. In Vermont, returns were obtained only from the three western counties. No estimate has been made for the other nine, though from their geographical advantages, it is probable that considerable manufactories are to be found there. In the Southern and Western states, no less than thirty establishments have been reported to the committee, but having no accurate returns from those

states, they have preferred to omit them altogether. Some reluctance has also been found among the manufacturers in giving all the details required of them. A great proportion of them have mistaken the intent of the question respecting the capital which they employ, and returned only that which was invested in fixtures. The committee have not thought it proper to alter the amounts so returned, but they will here take the opportunity of saying, that so general has been this error, that they have no doubt that one fourth to one third might with propriety be added under this head to the total amount.

Notwithstanding these imperfections, the result of their labors is highly satisfactory, developing an amount of industry in this manufacture, which exceeds the most sanguine expectations of the committee. The statements speak for themselves, and derived as they are from authentic sources might be submitted without comment. A few observations, however, appear to the committee to be important.

From the best information which can be obtained, the cotton crop of the United States for the year ending Oct. 1, 1831, amounted to 1,038,847 bales.

Of this was grown in the Atlantic states	486,103 bales of 306 lbs.	148,747,518
In the South Western and Western states	552,744 bales of 411 lbs.	227,177,784
	Bales 1,038,847	lbs. 375,925,302

The amount of cotton consumed in the United States, it will be observed, is more than one fifth of the whole cotton crop of the United States. And the value of the product, allowing that it is increased four fold in the process of manufacture, must be four fifths of that of the Cotton crop, and equal in value to that of the whole export. Another view is more striking. According to Pitkin's statistics, the export of Cotton from the United States, so late as 1819, was only 87,397,645 lbs., and the whole consumption of Great Britain the same year was 428,000 bags. If these figures be correct, our manufactures now consume seven eighths as much as was exported twelve years ago, and nearly one half as much as was then consumed in Great Britain. Nay more, they consume one third as much as Great Britain does now. Indeed, the progress of the cotton manufacture in the United States, under the protective policy, is believed to be without a parallel in the history of commerce. So extraordinary did its early development appear to British apprehensions, taught to consider their own country as possessing a monopoly of science, art, industry and skill, that the following language was applied by a very intelligent writer in Edinburgh to a report on this subject, presented to congress in 1816.

"The great extent of the cotton manufacture in the United States, stated in the preceding report, is more like what the sanguine views of the parties had contemplated, than what had been actually achieved. Indeed, it would have been impossible, even in a country with an extensive population and established manufacturing habits, to have reared in the time a manufacture of the magnitude they mention. But whatever prosperity it had attained was put an end to by the restoration of peace with England,

and this, notwithstanding the heavy tax levied on foreign cotton goods.—That the failure of these attempts, however, was not occasioned by any defect in the plan or general conduct of the establishments, we know from a gentleman who visited the principal cotton works in America in 1816. He found the machinery in many of them of excellent construction; and those who had the charge of them were men who had been bred in this country and who were possessed of both skill and judgment. But the circumstances in the state of America which we have mentioned were so adverse to the nature of the undertaking as to render success in the opinion of these persons impossible."

Fortunately, the predictions of our trans-Atlantic friends, like most of the visions of the philosophers of free trade, have not been verified by experience. The cotton manufacture continued to extend itself, and has triumphed over every obstacle. The export of cotton from the United States during the five years immediately preceding the war averaged about 57,000,000 lbs. and it is evident that the culture could not have increased during the continuance of the war. We have no data whereby to estimate with precision the quantity consumed at home previous to the tariff of 1816. It will be a large allowance if we compute it at one sixth of the cotton crop of the United States. This would give about 11,000,000 lbs. It is now 77,000,000 lbs. an increase of six hundred per cent. in sixteen years. Let us compare this with the progress of the manufacture in Great Britain, a progress which has justly been a theme of national exultation to every writer on the subject. The average annual consumption in Great Britain from 1781 to 1785 was 10,941,943 lbs.; from 1805 to 1810, 76,601,775 lbs., giving an increase identical with ours, but requiring a period of thirty years. It is now estimated in the London Price-Current for January, 1832, at 245,000,000 lbs., an increase of 220 per cent. in 22 years. Taking the same 16 years, from 1816 to 1832, the British increase was from 93,920,055 lbs. to 245,000,000, or 160 per cent. against 600 per cent. in this country. The greatest increase in any five years since 1790 in the United Kingdom is 56 per cent. In the United States it is 100 per cent. in the last four years, notwithstanding the check which the manufacture received in 1828 and 1829.

We shall be admitted to have fairly proved that the progress of the United States in this manufacture stands unrivalled. It may be attributed to the enterprizing spirit, to the industry and ingenuity of our countrymen, aided by the immense advantage of producing the staple at home. This advantage has enabled us to apply the finer kinds of cotton to heavier fabrics than had before been attempted. It is well known that the quality of cotton which is used in this country is much finer than that in general use in England. And in this lies the fallacy of a comparison of prices of cotton in the two countries, that the quality is entirely different. It would be a curious illustration of the doctrine of free trade, if cotton should be cheaper in Liverpool than New York, under the pressure of town dues and dock dues, commissions, duties, and a double rate of freight. In fact, cotton of the quality which we require is cheaper by about two cents in the pound in this country than in England. And the manufacture which has in consequence sprung up, has supplanted, to a very great extent, articles made either of linen or of foreign cotton. It is within the personal knowledge of every merchant, conversant with the importation of foreign goods, that there was scarcely such a thing heard of as British cotton sheetings before the manufacture of them was attempted in this country. In the year 1787, the cotton used in England was for the following purposes:

Candlewicks, - - -	1,500,000
Hoisery, - - - -	1,500,000
Silk and linen mixtures, - -	2,000,000
Fustians, - - - -	6,000,000
Calicoes and muslins, - -	11,600,000
lbs.	22,600,000

Neither sheetings nor shirtings are mentioned in this enumeration.—We were supplied with the cottons of India and the linens of the North of Europe. We have a memorial before us from the manufacturers of cotton in Massachusetts, presented to Congress in 1815, in which a specific or minimum duty is prayed for, with the express view of prohibiting the importation of all the coarser cotton fabrics manufactured beyond the Cape of Good Hope. We quote from that memorial:

"The articles, whose prohibition we pray for, are made of very inferior materials, and are manufactured in a manner calculated to deceive rather than to serve the consumer. No part of the produce of the United States enters into their composition. They are the work of foreign hands on a foreign material. Yet are they thrown into this country in such abundance, as to threaten the exclusion of its more useful and substantial manufactures. They injuriously affect the industry, not only of the manufaturing but of the agricultural states, and they cause a continual drain of specie. The prohibiting their importation, except for exportation, would, we apprehend, be attended with salutary effects upon the cultivators and manufacturers of the staple of the South. We discern no particular in which their importation for consumption can for a moment be thought generally beneficial, unless the revenue they afford, may be so considered. This being derived from an ad valorem duty, and the cost of the Indian cotton fabrics, of the coarser kinds, being there very inconsiderable, a small sum pays the duty on a large quantity. We are satisfied the revenue would be more than compensated for any supposed loss, arising from the prohibition of their importation, by the increased use and consumption in the American manufactories of the articles subject to high duties, and necessary in the manufacture of cotton. Besides, the cherishing these manufactures will be attended with increase of population. There will be more labor and greater earnings, more consumption, and thus greater contribution to the national wealth."

This memorial suggested, so far as we know, the first idea of a minimum duty on cotton cloth. It was prayed for, in express terms, as a prohibition. The wise and patriotic Legislature of that year granted the prayer of the petitioners, and the consequences have been infinitely advantageous to the prosperity of the country. Our manufacturers have been enabled to supply the whole of this vast continent with goods of excellent quality made of our native cotton. The coarse and flimsy fabrics of the East have disappeared. Had not the domestic manufacture been thus providentially encouraged by the enlightened statesmen of that day, what would have been at this moment the condition of the cotton growing states?

The cotton crop of the United States in 1816 did not exceed	68,000,000 lbs.
It is now 1,038,847 bales averaging 361 86-100 lbs., or	376,000,000
The increase since 1816 being in round numbers	300,000,000

During this same period, the consumption of Great Britain has increased only from 94,000,000 to 245,000,000 lbs. or about 150,000,000

Excess of the increase of production above the increase of the wants of our "great customer" 150,000,000 lbs.

This immense increase in the production is owing to the extended cultivation of cotton in states where it was scarcely grown before. No doubt the price of the raw material has very much declined. In a letter now before us, from a merchant of very high standing to a member of Congress, dated April 15, 1816, the price of cotton for the ten preceding years is stated to have been below 15 cents. It is now, on the average, about 8 cts. There has been, since that period, a corresponding decline in almost every article of trade, occasioned probably by the state of general peace, and some appreciation of the standard or circulating medium. But what would it have been without the extension of that manufacture in the United States, which has provided a market for more than one half of this surplus?

It will be alleged that the goods made at home would have been made in England if the tariff had not been passed, and that the price of that part of our cotton which is exported is sold at lower prices, because Europe cannot afford to buy more than we will allow her to pay for by her fabrics.

To this latter objection, it is a sufficient reply, that at this very moment we import more than we can pay for by our exports. This is proved by the extensive shipments of specie, and by the high price of Exchange on London.

To the former, we have already replied, that the kinds of goods which constitute the staple manufacture of this country never were made elsewhere at all, and your committee firmly believe never can be made so advantageously as at home. It will be observed by statement D, that of the coarse and heavy fabrics to which the attention of the manufacturers was in the first instance necessarily directed, the price had fallen in the 14 years from 1816 to 1830, two thirds, while that of the raw material had declined, notwithstanding the immense increase of production, only one half. This result is entirely to be attributed to the increased skill of the manufacturers, and to competition among themselves. It may be affirmed and rigidly proved that this particular fabric can be, at this moment, made at a less price in this country than in any other. Of what necessity then, it may be asked, is the protecting duty of 8 3-4 cents a square yard? We answer, 1st. that if the position here advanced be correct, the duty so far as these goods are concerned cannot operate as a tax, and that the effect of repealing it would be to excite a foreign competition, which, however ruinous to the importer, who would ultimately be driven from the market, would in the meanwhile produce great confusion and distress at home. 2d. That the cotton manufacture has doubled itself within five years, extending gradually to the finer goods, which require more skill and less of the raw material, and which consequently are less protected by the existing system of a minimum duty. As competition increases, it may be expected that finer and more elaborated textures will be attempted. We affirm that the pledges of the manufacturers have been fully redeemed by the existing low price of coarse goods, the only ones contemplated in the enactment of the Tariff of 1816, and that the same result will follow in fine goods, if the protection now extended to them shall be continued. The effect of a reduction of duty will be to drive back the capital and machinery employed in these upon the coarse fabrics, which are already produced to the full extent of consumption. It is not with manufacturers as

with merchants. There is an elasticity about commerce which enables it soon to accommodate itself to any changes in the national policy. If one branch of trade becomes unprofitable, others will be pursued. The tonnage of the United States has increased more rapidly since the tariff act of 1824, than for an equal number of years preceding it. There is reason to believe that the increase of 1831—2 will be found to have been greater than that of any one year since the peace. Any derangements, therefore, in the course of trade, which were produced by the tariff, have been adjusted. Our ships and seamen have found advantageous employment in other directions. The coasting trade, which Adam Smith pronounces to be far the most profitable branch of national commerce, has extended itself prodigiously. Capital once invested in buildings and machinery cannot be withdrawn. The business must be pursued, or the ruin is immediate and irretrievable. There is no such thing as receding. A duty of six and a quarter cents a square yard, the committee admit, would have been amply sufficient for the protection of the coarser goods, had no other ever been imposed. But another has been imposed, and under the sanction of that other, an immense impulse has been given to the industry of the country towards the finer fabrics. Repeal it now and every spindle will be turned to the production of coarser goods, and the result will be no less disastrous to the capital employed in the one branch than in the other. It may be proposed to alter the scale of duties with a view of having them bear more lightly on coarse goods. The committee believe that such a measure would produce a derangement in trade, without any possible advantage; that it would lead to extensive frauds upon the revenue, and in its nature could not be effectively enforced.

It was urged, and with great weight, against the tariff acts when first proposed, that material changes in the policy of nations should be entered into with great caution; that a clear case of public expediency should be made out; that such changes are always attended with individual loss and embarrassment, and that government should interfere as seldom as possible with the course of individual trade. These arguments your committee believe to be just, and they apply with a ten-fold force to the vital change which is now proposed in the system of the country.

The committee, have turned their attention with great interest to the influence of the cotton manufacture upon the moral habits and character of the operatives. It is well known, that in the old world, no class of the working population is more degraded or worse educated. In this country, the committee have the pleasure to say, none is more respectable and intelligent, or better educated. In Europe, manufactures are established in large cities, the business is followed from parent to child, and wages are so miserably low, that few families can be supported without parochial aid. One consequence of this abject poverty is, that children are set to work at a very tender age, and have no time allowed for education, literary or moral. In the United States manufactures are dispersed through the country. The operatives are, to a considerable extent, females who come into the factories, after having acquired their education, who stay there but a few years, and whose liberal wages enable them during those few years to lay up considerable sums of money. In many factories, the proprietors have instituted savings banks, to encourage the economy of the operatives, by enabling them to deposit such portions, however small, of their earnings, as they could spare, the proprietors allowing a moderate rate of interest, and being responsible for the safety of the capital. In one factory, which

has made a return on this subject to the committee, where the wages amount to about sixty thousand dollars per annum, the fund thus laid by has accumulated in four years to the sum of twenty-six thousand four hundred dollars, or about eleven per cent. on the whole amount of wages paid.

It will be observed that no less than thirty-nine thousand females find employment in the cotton factories of the United States, whose aggregate wages amount to upwards of four millions of dollars annually. This immense sum, paid for the wages of females, may be considered as so much clear gain to the country. Before the establishment of these and other domestic manufactures, this labor was almost without employment. Daughters are now emphatically a blessing to the farmer. Many instances have occurred within the personal knowledge of individuals of this committee, in which the earnings of daughters have been scrupulously hoarded to enable them to pay off mortgages on the paternal farm.

In almost all the factories, from which returns have been received, three months in the year are allowed to all the children employed, for the purpose of education, and in the more considerable ones, schools are supported at the expense of the factory, at which the children of all the persons employed in or dependent upon the establishment are permitted to receive regular instruction throughout the year, without charge.

In conclusion, the committee would remark, that the number of persons returned as depending upon these establishments, gives but a very inadequate view of the amount of industry encouraged and remunerated by them. Reed-makers, picker-makers, shuttle and bobbin-makers, card-manufacturers, leather dressers, paper-makers, and a host of other artificers with their families, are as strictly dependent upon the cotton factories, and would be as much deprived of bread by the withdrawal of protection, as those who are enumerated as residing upon the premises,—whilst the farmer, who before was earning a scanty subsistence, now finds a market for every portion of his surplus produce, and thus acquires a revenue beyond his immediate wants, the true source of independence and wealth. No one who has witnessed the prosperity which visibly extends itself around the manufacturing districts, the air of increased comfort and improved cultivation, will hesitate to attribute it to their influence. Nor are the mechanical arts and agricultural industry alone fostered. The village steeple is an unfailing companion to the water-wheel, and the liberal professions, and all the arts which minister to the wants and comforts of man, find their best remuneration amidst the population which the enlightened policy of the government has gathered around it.

The committee in these remarks have rigidly confined themselves to the subject assigned to them, that of the cotton manufacture. They are fully aware that there is no claim for precedence of one branch of domestic industry above the rest. The great interests of iron, woollens, leather, coal, &c. will receive attention from their several committees. And, after all, the mechanic arts, extending as they do to an infinite variety of productions, and spread over the whole face of the country, enlivening with their industry every town, village and hamlet in the United States, give food to more individuals, and are more essentially dependent upon commercial protection, more vitally connected with the American System, than any other interest except the main pillar of national strength, the Agricultural.

P. T. JACKSON.

Chairman of the Committee.

Boston, Feb. 11, 1832.

STATEMENT A.

COTTON MILLS.

	Virginia.	Maryland.	Maine.	Vermont	N. Hampshire.	Mass.	Connecticut.	R. Island.	New-York.	New-Jersey.	Pennsylvania.	Delaware.	Total.	Machine Shops, see statement B.	Bleacheries, see statement C.	Printeries, see statement E.	Total.
Capital, - - -	$290,000	2,144,000	765,000	295,500	5,300,000	12,894,000	2,825,000	6,262,340	3,671,500	2,027,644	3,758,500	384,500	$40,614,984	2,400,000	900,000	1,000,000	$44,914,984
Number of Mills, -	7	23	8	17	40	250	94	146	112	51	67	10	795				
Number of Spindles,	9,844	47,722	6,500	12,392	113,776	339,777	115,528	235,753	157,316	62,979	120,810	24,806	1,246,503				
Number of Looms,	91	1,002	164	352	3,530	8,981	2,609	5,773	3,653	815	6,301	235	33,506				
Pounds of Yarn sold,	869,000	1,104,000	none	101,000	none	807,366	487,900	none ret.	1,867,790	3,212,184	2,192,865	none ret.	10,642,000				
Yards of Cloth, -	675,000	7,649,000	1,750,000	2,238,400	29,060,500	79,231,000	20,055,500	37,121,681	21,010,920	5,133,776	21,332,467	5,203,746	230,461,990				
Pounds of Cloth, -	168,000	2,224,000	525,000	574,500	7,255,060	24,301,062	5,612,000	9,271,481	5,297,713	1,877,418	4,207,192	1,291,500	59,604,926				
Males employed, -	143	824	54	102	875	2,665	1,399	1,731	1,374	2,151	6,545	676	18,539	3,200	612	950	23,301
" Wages per week,	$2 73	3 87	5 50	5 00	6 25	7 00	4 50	5 25	6 00	6 00	6 00	5 00		7 50	6 00	7 00	
Females employed,	275	1,793	205	363	4,090	10,678	2,477	3,297	3,652	3,070	8,351	676	38,927		126	125	39,178
" Wages per week,	$1 58	1 91	2 33	1 84	2 60	2 25	2 20	2 20	1 90	1 90	2 00	2 00			2 88	2 52	
Children under 12 years,	none	none	none	19	00	none	439	3,472	484	217	none	none	4,691			430	5,121
" Wages per week,				1 40	2 00		1 50	1 50	1 40	1 40						1 82	
Lbs. of Cotton used,	1,152,000	3,008,000	588,500	760,000	7,845,000	24,871,981	6,777,209	10,414,578	7,961,670	5,832,204	7,111,174	1,435,000	77,757,316				
Lbs. of Starch, - -	5,500	none	15,000	3,200	164,000	907,480	187,135	324,908	34,030	none	none	none	1,641,253		429,625		2,070,878
Brls of Flour for sizing,	50	874	70	302	1,900	2,351	516	1,334	2,409	975	5,714	750	17,245			1,300	18,545
Cords of Wood, -	200	6,148	400	903	7,300	9,476	7,193	1,440	7,038	671	5,000	750	46,519			30,000	76,519
Tons of Coal, - -	1,000	65	none	none	1,500	2,621	247	1,410	488	1,007	15,314	768	24,420		19,250	2,250	45,920
Bushels of Charcoal,	none	400	none	none	none	4,635	3,350	none	none	820	none	none	9,205				
Gallons of Oil, - -	2,070	12,875	2,700	3,020	40,000	68,428	25,217	61,457	35,923	13,348	29,300	6,000	300,338			2,800	303,138
Value of other articles,	$2,000	31,045	3,200	5,720	103,000	180,677	30,065	77,433	60,335	18,208	74,640	12,000	$599,223	1,960,212	276,265	930,585	$3,766,285
Spindles building, -	none ret.	none ret	20,000	9,200	30,000	69,880	18,036	none ret.	13,908	11,000	none ret.	none ret.	172,024				
Hand-Weavers, - -	none ret.	none ret	none	none	none	none	none	none	none	1,060	3,700	none	4,760				
Total dependants, -	270	4,208	389	1,511	8,000	2 ,211	7,266	17,567	12,954	12,750	25,000	2,500	117,626	9,600	1,403	2,860	131,489
Annual value, - -													$26,000,000	3,500,000	1,036,760	1,500,000	32,036,760
Aggregate Wages,													$10,294,944	1,248,000	209,814	402,965	12,155,723

Remarks.——Delaware includes $162,000, and Pennsylvania $500,000 for the Capital employing the hand-looms.——The Cotton consumed, 77,757,316 lbs. is 214,882 bales of the average weight of 361 86-100.

STATEMENT B.

MACHINE SHOPS.

The consumption of cotton in the United States was computed in the New-York Price Current to have been for the year ending 1st October, 1827, 103,000 bales. It is now 214,882 bales,—thus more than doubling in four years. The number of spindles being now 1,246,503, this rate of increase would require upwards of 300,000 spindles, new machinery, to be built yearly. In addition to this, repairs are constantly required, and occasionally entire renovation.

It will, therefore, be an estimate very much within the truth, if we assume that the machine shops of the United States are capable of turning out 250,000 spindles per annum.

We have returns from several of the largest machine shops, from which we derive the following estimates for the capital, labor and materials required to build these 250,000 spindles, with preparation and weaving, including also the gearing of the cotton mills:

Capital $2,400,000.
Men employed 3,200, at $7 50 average wages,—aggregate $1,348,000.
Annual value of product $3,500,000.
They require about 7776 tons of cast iron.

"	"	"	3200	" "	wrought iron and steel.
"	"	"	2400	chaldrons of sea coal.	
"	"	of	sheet cards - - - - - - - -	in value	$184,320
"	"	"	paints and oil - - - - - - -	" "	48,000
"	"	"	ash plank and pine - - - - -	" "	153,000
"	"	"	soapstone - - - - - - - -	" "	33,600
"	"	"	hard-ware, files, &c. - - - -	" "	240,000

STATEMENT C.

PRINTERIES.

The quantity of Cotton Goods printed in the United States is computed in the Encyclopædia Americana, to be not short of 40,000,000 of yards.—As, however, we have not been able to procure accurate returns on this subject, we shall assume that only 25,000,000 of yards are printed. From accurate returns received from several of the largest establishments, printing upwards of 15,000,000 of yards, we have prepared the following estimates:

Capital employed about $1,000,000.

Men	"	950	at $7 00	per	week.
Females	"	125	" 2 50	"	"
Boys	"	430	" 1 82	"	"

Aggregate wages per annum, $402,965.

Using	1,300	barrels flour for sizing.
"	2,250	tons of coal.
"	30,000	cords of wood.
"	3,500	gallons of oil.
"	30,000	lbs. of gum senegal, arabic, &c.
"	53,110	" " sumac.
"	10,000	" " Persian and Turkey berries.
"	819,260	" " madder.
"	222,670	" " indigo.
"	572,140	" " logwood.
"	22,500	" " copper rollers.

Other articles, chiefly of American production or manufacture, as boiler iron, cast-iron, lime, quercitron bark, pyroligenous acid, and various chemical preparations, in value $430,000.

STATEMENT D.

The following table presents the actual cost of the cotton used in the manufacture of yard-wide sheetings, made of No. 14 yarn, and weighing about 3 yards to the pound, and also the price received for the sheetings. The cost of the cotton, being in every instance, the price delivered at the factory, and the price of the sheetings the nett value at the nearest seaport.

1817	Cotton	28	cts.	sheetings	25	cts.	is per lb. of cloth, after deducting the cost of the raw material		43 cts.
1818	"	32	"		28	"	"	"	46
1819	"	30 1-2	"		18	"	"	"	19
1820	"	17 1-2	"		18	"	"	"	34
1821	"	17 3-4	"		18	"	"	"	33 3-4
1822	"	20	"		18	"	"	"	32
1823	"	15 1-2	"		15	"	"	"	28
1824	"	16 3-4	"		13 1-2	"	"	"	22
1825	"	18 1-2	"		13 1-2	"	"	"	20
1826	"	17	"		12 1-2	"	"	"	18 3-4
1827	"	14 1-5	"		12 1-2	"	"	"	21 5-6
1828	"	12 4-5	"		11 1-2	"	"	"	20 1-2
1829	"	11 3-4	"		8 1-2	"	"	"	12 1-2
1830	"	11 1-6	"		8 3-4	"	"	"	14
1831	"	11	"		10 1-2	"	"	"	19 1-2

The cotton used at this factory is of superior quality.

The last column gives the cost of making, with all charges, the wear and tear so far as provided against by the regular repairs, the interest of the capital employed, and the profit.

STATEMENT E.

BLEACHERIES.

Assuming that one third of the goods manufactured are bleached, which is believed to be not far from the truth, the following is an approximated estimate of the capital, labor, &c.

Capital employed $900,000.
Males about 612, average wages $6 00 per week.
Females " 126, " " 2 88 " "
Aggregate wages $209,814 per annum.
Starch - - used 429,625 lbs.
Coal - - " 19,250 tons.
Bleaching salts " 520,000 lbs.
Oil of Vitriol " 585,400 lbs.
Lime - - " 2,500 casks.
Ashes - - " 11,153 cwt.
Other materials, domestic, value $109,100.
" " foreign " 41,025.

APPENDIX.

The Permanent Committee believe that the facts stated below may be usefully added to the valuable report of the Committee on the manufactures of Cotton, for a better understanding of the whole subject.

(1)

EXPORTS OF COTTON FROM THE UNITED STATES.

In 1791, only 189,316 lbs., in 1794, 1,601,760 lbs., 1798, 9,360,005 lbs., 1800, 17,789,803 lbs. The value of cotton was first officially given for 1802, and we shall commence a general statement with that year—abstracted from the treasury tables; the value per lb. is the average of the whole, sea-island and other.

Years.	*Pounds.*	*Value—$*	*Cents per lb.*	*Prices of Uplands in Liverpool in each of the following years.*
1802	27,501,075	5,250,000	19 009	January, - 22 *pence.*
1803	41,105,623	7,920,000	19.002	February, - 16¼
1804	38,118,041	7,650,000	20 000	December, - 21
1805	40,383,491	9,445,000	23.003	" - 23
1806	37,491,282	8,332,000	22.002	" - 19
1807	66,212,787	14,232,000	21.004	January, - 18½
1808	12,064,366	2,221,000	18 004	December, - 35
1809	53,210,225	8,515,000	16.000	December, - 22
1810	93,874,201	15,108,000	15.009	February, - 21
1811	62,186,081	9,652,000	15.005	" - 15
1812	28,952,544	3,080,000	14.000	——— ———
1813	19,399,911	2,324,000	17.003	January, - 21¾
1814	17,806,479	2,683,000	15.000	" - 35¼
1815	82,998,747	17,529,000	21.001	" - 20¾
1816	81,747,116	24,106,000	29.004	December, - 17¾a20¾
1817	85,649,328	22,628,000	26.004	" - 18¼a22¼
1818	92,471,178	31,334,258	33.008	" - 17a20
1819	87,997,045	21,081,769	23.009	" - 12¼a14
1820	127,860,152	22,308,667	17.607	" - 8¼a10¾
1821	124,893,405	20,157,484	16.001	" - 8a10½
1822	144,675,095	24,035,058	16.006	" - 6½a8½
1823	173,723,270	20,445,520	11.007	" - 7½a9¾
1824	142,369,663	21,947,401	15.004	" - 8¾a10½
1825	176,449,907	36,846,649	20.008	" - 6¾a9¾
1826	204,535,415	25,025,214	12.008	" - 6¾a7½
1827	294,310,115	29,359,545	9.009	" - 5a6¾
1828	210,590,463	22,487,229	10.007	" - 5¾a6½
1829	264,837,186	26,575,311	10.000	" - 6¼a7
1830	298,459,102	29,674,883	9.009	" - 5¾a7⅛

The column of prices at Liverpool are derived from a late pamphlet published by Mr. *Carey*, and is correct. Mr. C. remarks that cotton at Liverpool fell 29 per cent from 1818 to 1819; that it fell 17 per cent. in the next year, 1820; that in December 1830 it was within a penny a pound as high as in 1822, in 1830 was higher than in 1827; and he well calls 1825 the "bubble year."

The whole simply shews the fact, as by reference to the next table will more certainly appear, that price depends on supply and demand. The effect of the enormous importation of East India cotton in 1818 and 1819, (exceeding the supply from the United States) is clearly seen.

(2)

BRITISH IMPORTS OF COTTON.

Years.	*U. States.* Bales.	*Brazil & Portugal.* Bales.	*E. Indies.* Bales.	*West Indies, &c.* Bales.	*Total number of Bags and Bales.*	*Total in lbs. weight.*
1802	107,494	74,720	8,535	90,654	281,383	77,393,600
1803	106,831	76,247	10,296	45,474	238,848	59,929,990
1804	104,103	48,588	2,661	86,385	241,637	70,506,355
1805	124,274	51,242	1,983	75,116	252,620	72,229,537
1806	124,939	51,034	7,787	77,678	261,738	75,157,530
1807	171,267	18,981	11,409	81,010	282,667	86,206,870
1808	37,672	50,442	12,512	67,512	168,138	22,676,740
1809	135,000	166,107	35,764	103,511	442,382	117,775,530
1810	140,516	149,535	79,382	92,186	561,173	136,570,735
1811	128,192	118,514	14,646	64,789	326,141	91,662,535
1812	95,331	98,714	2,617	64,563	261,215	63,027,570
1813	37,721	137,168	1,421	73,218	249,503	49,820,530
1814	48,000	151,500	13,500	74,500	287,500	59,745,373
1815	201,000	91,200	24,300	54,900	371,400	96,720,370
1816	166,000	124,000	31,000	44,000	370,000	94,140,330
1817	195,560	114,490	117,955	49,155	477,160	125,132,230
1818	219,950	160,200	247,300	57,850	660,300	177,257,375
1819	212,250	125,450	178,300	31,070	545,070	150,735,728
1820	301,200	179,700	57,300	31,950	577,150	143,637,325
1821	300,100	121,050	24,700	37,250	488,100	128,573,275
1822	330,000	143,200	14,300	40,650	533,150	139,797,735
1823	448,070	184,070	38,650	33,610	668,400	180,233,795
1824					540,976	
1825					821,286	
1826					581,872	
1827					894,107	
1828					749,254	
1829					741,074	
1830					871,883	

(3)

British consumption and export of cotton, and stock on hand, at the close of each year given.

years	*Cotton consumed.* Bales.	*Cotton exported.* Bales.	*Stock remaining.* Bales.	*years*	*Cotton consumed.* Bales.	*Cotton exported.* Bales.	*Stock remaining.* Bales.
1816	345,000	30,000	76,600	1824	636,401	*	235,300
1817	397,000	22,700	114,000	1825	564,487		415,500
1818	424,000	60,000	297,500	1826	551,453		342,306
1819	425,540	65,800	350,340	1827	681,000		446,825
1820	488,030	27,500	404,730	1828	750,473		404,866
1821	486,473	51,000	356,300	1729	746,147		290,750
1822	541,690	58,700	286,434	1830	870,218		319,343
1823	535,656	39,700	383,393	1831	†245,000,000	† pounds	

*Further returns are not given in the tables; but the average may be pretty nearly determined by the examples given.

(4)

Real, or declared, value of British exports of cotton piece goods and hosiery and cotton yarn, from 1816 to 1828, inclusive.

Years.	Plain Cottons.	Other Goods.	Hosiery, &c.	Yarn.	Value to United States.	Total Value.
	L.	L.	L.	L.	L.	L.
1816	——	——	——	2,628,488	——	13,072,758
1817	——	——	——	2,014,131	——	14,178,021
1818	——	——	——	2,385,305	——	16,643,179
1819	——	——	——	2,516,783	——	12,388,833
1820	——	——	——	2,826,643	——	13,843,569
1821	——	——	——	2,307,830	——	13,786,958
1822	——	——	——	2,700,437	——	14,532,253
1823	5,884,935	7,095,709	720,014	2,625,947	1,658,011	13,751,658
1824	6,437,817	8,010,438	869,336	3,135,396	2,003,024	18,452,987
1825	6,027,892	8,205,118	919,787	3,206,726	2,310,449	18,359,523
1826	4,477,942	5,388,592	735,497	3,491,338	1 455,100	14,093,369
1827	5,763,576	7,184,459	1,144,552	3,545,578	2,528,578	17,638,165
1828	5,623,802	6,859,447	1,165,763	3,595,405	1,804.003	17,244,417

The value of the hosiery and small wares shipped to the United States is about one-fifth of the whole quantity exported, one year with another.

The export of cotton yarn to the United States in 1828. was valued at £6,515, in 1823, £261; 1824 £2,372; 1825, £1,817; 1826, £871; 1827, £1,515.

The plain and other Cotton Goods exported to the United States, were as follows:

	PLAIN.		OTHER.	
Years.	Yards.	Value, *l.*	Yards.	Value, *l.*
1823	14,202,580	592,769	24,046,801	951,296
1824	15,771,618	660,690	26,171,669	1,162,617
1825	13,222,548	601,325	33,549,124	1,517,770
1826	9,858,224	404,467	21,446,139	934,445
1827	17,526,489	687,620	35,330,320	1,570,335
1828	10,359,707	404,922	25,840,720	1,207,544

Total yards exported.

Years.	Plain.	Other.	Lbs. of Yarn.
1823	152,184,867	149,631,387	27,378,986
1824	170,091,384	174,559,749	33,605,510
1825	158,039,781	178,426,912	32,641,604
1826	138,159,783	128,897,111	42,179,661
1827	183,749,186	181,543,618	44,878,774
1828	189,475,956	173,852,475	50,505,751

[The preceding statements, 2, 3, 4, are derived, with the exception of a few items, from Mr. *Force's* very valuable NATIONAL CALENDAR for 1831: we have no means of supplying the amounts for 1829, 1830 and 1831. The facts stated, however, afford many subjects for important reflections.]

(5)

A considerable portion of the British cotton goods sent to the United States, are exported to other places. The treasury tables do not discriminate between British and other foreign goods exported; but nearly all the *foreign* cotton manufactures shipped from the United States, are of British origin. Nankins are not included in these tables.

Exports of foreign cotton goods from the U. States in the years given.

years	Plain.	Other.	Hosiery.	Yarn and Thread.	Total.
1821	$320,302	$379,710	$2,330	$6,532	$708,874
1822	341,371	572,626	17,314	8,817	940,128
1823	520,506	206,502	36,881	24,767	788,656
1824	608,068	1,544,231	79,191	8,474	2,239.964
1825	705,339	1,105,252	46,311	9,412	1,866,314
1826	682,407	1,032,381	74,462	——	1,789,250
1827	495,188	964,909	46,788	63,413	1,570,298
1828	406,623	1,402,103	44.938	46,736	1,900,400
1829	302,435	751,871	42,222	27,656	1,124,184
1830	475,171	995,028	57,104	58,325	1.585,528

The treasury tables have another column for "All other manufactures of cotton paying a duty of 25 per cent." the amount of which is about 50,000 dollars a year, and should be added where precision is required.

As very nearly the whole of these goods exported were entitled to drawback, —it would appear that they either came to a bad market in the United States, or were originally destined for a foreign one.

(6)

Exports of American Cotton Manufactures.

	1826	1827	1828	1829	1830
White piece goods,	$821.629	$951,001	$887,628	$931,870	$964,196
Printed do.	68,884	45,120	76,012	145,024	61,800
Nankin, - -	8,903	14,750	5,149	1,878	1,093
Twist, Yarn, &c.	11,135	11,175	12,570	8,849	24,744
All other, - -	227,574	137,368	28,873	127,836	266,850
	$1.138.125	$1.159,414	$1.010,232	$1.259,457	$1,318,183

The preceding shews the real values in the years given—1826 is the first year in which the value of cotton manufactures is stated.

(7)

ENGLISH EXPORTS OF COTTON GOODS, &c.—1830.

Statement shewing the weight of Yarn in manufactured goods exported from England, alone, in 1830.

Description.	No. of Yds	yards in each piece.	No. of pieces.	Weight of yarn in each		lbs. of Yarn.
Calicoes, printed, - -	159.432,588	28	5,694,021	4	0	22.676,084
Calicoes, plain, - - -	190,262,892	24	7.927.625	5	12	45,583 843
Cambrics and Muslins, -	19 705,623	20	985,281	2	8	2.463,203
Velveteens, Velvets, Cords, &c.	4,999.930	60	81,632	20		1,633 640
Quillings and Ribs, - -	93.857	60	15 643	9		140,587
Cotton and Linen mixed, -	2.097 767	40.	52.444	8		419.552
Ginghams, - - - -	1,231.160	20	61,558	2	8	153.895
Ticks, Checks and Stripes, -	491.440	50	9.829	20		196,580
Dimities, - - - - -	249.702	60	4.161	8		33,288
Damask and Diaper, - -	33.294	86	914	10		9,240
Nankins, - - - -	3,471,048	50	69,423	8		555.384
Lawns and Lenos, - -	17.405	20	870	1		870
Lace, - - - - -	69,603,688	30	2,320.122	0	4	580,030
Imitation Shawl Cloths, -	73,080	12	6,090	2	8	15.325
Counterpanes and Quilts, -	74,648	no.	74,648	7	0	522,536
Shawls and Hdkfs. - -	243.536	doz.	243.536	2	8	618 835
Tapes, Bobbins, &c. - -	86.684	,,	86 684	1	0	86 684
Hosiery, - - - - -	346,313	,,	346 313	2	8	779.204
Unenumerated, - - -	80,404	£	per £ stg.	10		864 040
Total amount of Yarn exported in manufactured goods,						77,272 820

(7, *continued.*)

Exports to United States.

Cotton Yarn	29,736 lbs.
do. Thread	220,611 lbs
Printed Calicoes	31,505,709 yds
Plain do.	12,937,310 yds
Cambrics and Muslins	189,120 yds
Velveteens, &c.	70,022 yds
Quillings	1,825 yds
Cotton & linen mixed	109,047 yds
Ginghams	140,288 yds
Lawns and Lenoes	50 yds
Imitation Shawl Cloths	67,944 yds
Lace	4,447,526 yds
Counterpanes and Quilts	4,457 No.
Shawls and Hdkfs.	13,090 doz
Tapes and Bobbins	48,095 doz
Hosiery	41,778 doz
Unenumerated	L. 23,727

Yarn Exported.

United States	lbs. 29,736
Belgium	7,400,000
British N. A.	162 000
Hanse Towns	22,000,000
India and China	3,400 000
Naples and Sicily	3 300,000
Russia	17,500 000
Sardinia	2,750,000
Trieste, Venice and Austria	2,800 000
Turkey and Levant	1,800,000

Printed Calicoes Exported.

United States	yds. 31,505,709
Belgium	15,700,000
Hanse Towns	15,300,000
India and China	10.000,000
Mexico	6,600,000
Portugal and Azores	8,260,000
Sardinia and Tuscany	22,000,000
Turkey and Levant	7,400,000

Plain Calicoes Exported.

United States	yds. 12,937,300
Belgium	yds. 2,117,0000
Brazil	27,355,000
Hanse Towns	11,388,000
India and China	20,500,000
Mexico	20,000,000
Portugal	10 500,000
Spain	4,600,000
Sardinia	20,000,000
Turkey	16,800,000

Nankins Exported.

Hanse Towns	yds. 2,620,000

Cambrics and Muslins Exported.

United States,	yds. 189,120
Belgium	1,050,000
Hanse Towns	2,900,000
India and China	2,400,000
Russia	1,533,000
Turkey and Levant	8,950,000

Lace Exported.

United States	yds. 4,447,526
Belgium	15,000,000
British N. A.	3,000,000
Hanse Towns	36,000,000
India and China	761,000
Naples and Sicily	5,244,000
Sardinia and Tuscany	2,665,000

Increase in Exports, 1830.

Cotton Yarn	5,436,051 lbs.
do. Thread	169,117 lbs.
Printed Calicoes	30,548,586 yds
Plain do.	10,296.444 yds
Cambrics and Muslins	1,946,534 yds
Ginghams	461,526 yds
Cotton and Linen mixed	474.844 yds
Nankins	1,684.093 yds
Lace	30,581,378 yds
Counterpanes	28,367 No.
Shawls	78,091 doz

Consumption of Cotton Goods in England in 1830.

	Bags.	Average.	lbs.	Weekly av'ge
American	536,497	335 lbs.	179,726,495	10.317—13
Brazil	182,926	185	32,926,680	3,518—2
West India	14,149	300	4,244.700	272—5
Egyptian	23,978	250	5,994.500	461—6
East India	47,700	330	15,741,000	917—1(
Taken from 30,000 extra stock in hands of dealers & spinners, Jan. 1830	27,000	290	7,830,000	519—1!
	832,250		246,463 875	16,004—42
Allowed for loss on spinning, 1¾ oz. per lb.			26,967,869	
Total amount spun in England and Scotland			219.495,506 lbs.	
Deduct Yarn spun in Scotland,			22,924,955	
Total spun in England				196,570,551
Exported in Manufactured Goods			77,272 820 lbs.	
in Yarn,			62.694,302	
in Thread			1,074,931	
Yarn sent to Scotland and Ireland,			5,000,000	
Exported in mixed manufactures not enumerated, and consumed in candlewick, bands, healds, &c,			8,000,000	
Balance, home consumption and stock,			42,528,498	196,570,551

(7, *continued.*

Cotton consumed in England and Scotland, 1830,

	Bags.		Bags.	Bags—1829
England, - -	746,449	——weekly average	14,354—41	12,257
Scotland, - -	85,810	do.	1,650—1	1,427
	852,259		16,004—42	13,684
		Weekly increase 1830,	-	2,320*
Cotton spun in England in 1830,	196,570,551 lbs.—In 1829,			164,626,399 lbs.
do. in Scotland,	do. 22,934,955		do.	19,836·965
	219,495,506		do.	184,463 364
		Increase in 1830,		35,032,142 lbs.

*Or 120,640 bags in the year.

☞ The gentleman to whom the permanent committee are indebted for this interesting statement of the particular exports of England, observes—"I have made a hasty calculation, and if I am correct, all the English cotton goods sent to this country will require only about 27,000 bales at 335 lbs. to the bale—and this by adding 10 per cent. to the *weight* of the manufactured goods for loss in spinning, &c."

Now let us apply these facts to the business at home.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS FOR 1830.

	Imports.	*Exports.*	*Consumption.*
White Cotton Goods, -	$2,487,804 -	$475,171 - -	$2,012,633
Printed, &c. - - -	4,356,675 -	995,028 - -	3,361,647
Hosiery, &c. - - -	387,454 -	57,104 - -	330,350
Yarn and Thread, - -	172,785 -	58,325 - -	114,460
All other, - - -	229,375 -	55,310 - -	174,065
	$7,634,093	$1,640,938	$5.993,155.

The *real* cost of the cotton goods, so shewn to be consumed in the United States in the year 1830, according to the best evidence that can be obtained (the treasury tables) was - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $5,993,115
of which about four-fifths were of English manufacture, or the worth of $4,794,524
To make the whole quantity of English goods imported in 1830, required, as above stated, 9,045,000 lbs. cotton—one-fifth deducted leaves 7,236,000, say at 10 cents, - - - - - - - - - - 723,600

$4,070,924

Then, so far as the export of cotton to England, and the consumption of English cotton manufactures of the United States, are concerned—we sell to England 723,600 dollars' worth, and purchase of her 4,794,524 dollars' worth—*leaving a clear balance in favor of English labor in the large sum of* $4,070,924, *on this account only!* And the market for cotton in England, because of our consumption of her cotton manufactures, extending to no more than $723,000, is less than *one-tenth part* of the raw cotton consumed in the factories of the United States, being nearly 78,000,000 lbs. But this is not all—about one-third of the cotton sent to us from England, made up into piece goods, is *not of American growth*—as may be seen by referring to table (2).

With these exhibits, we leave the whole subject to the reflection of the reader. We receive, at the utmost, $723,600 for cotton, and pay, at the least, $4,794,524 for cotton goods—the balance is for the subsistence and profit of English laborers, the support of English agriculture, and the payment of English taxes and rates. A little while hence, if the domestic manufacture of cotton proceeds as it now is going on, nearly the whole of this balance will be for the subsistence and profit of American labor and American agriculture—and there will be a surplus of cottons supplied for exportation in a much larger amount than this balance—it being clearly manifest from present exports to *foreign* places, (probably exceeding $1,500,000, in 1831) that certain descriptions of our goods are fully competent, because of their cheapness of price and goodness of quality, to meet like articles made in England—as is proved from this fact, that the *American* goods exported in 1830, were pretty nearly equal in value to that of *all the foreign* cotton goods exported by us in that year, the drawback on the latter being obtained—and both were sent abroad *free of duty*, to encounter one another in distant markets.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURES OF GLASS.

The committee on the subject of the manufacture of glass, porcelain, and other manufactures of clay, in the United States, report:

That there are twenty-one furnaces, containing one hundred and forty pots, for the manufacture of flint-glass, located as follows, viz:

At Boston and its vicinity,	6	furnaces, with	38 pots.
Providence, R. I.	2	"	12
N. York, and its vicinity,	3	"	22
Philadelphia	1	"	6
Baltimore	2	"	12
Pittsburg, Pa.	4	"	32
Wellsburg "	2	"	12
Wheeling, Va.	1	"	6

The committee have received authentic information from two of the most extensive manufactories in the vicinity of Boston. These two establishments have had in operation for several years past, 4 furnaces with 28 pots.

They employ a capital of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars - - - - - - - - - -	$450,000
They manufacture annually, flint-glass of the value of more than four hundred thousand dollars - - -	400,000
They pay in wages annually, one hundred and forty thousand dollars - - - - - - - -	140,000
They give constant employment to two hundred and eighty-four men and eighty-five boys. *Men and boys*	369
The number of persons subsisted from the wages of the workmen employed, is fourteen hundred. *Persons*	1,400

The annual consumption of the most important materials used in the manufacture is as follows, viz:

403	tons or	806,000	lbs. of lead, from the mines of Illinois and Missouri.
250	do	500,000	do pearl ashes, from Maine New Hampshire and Vermont.
750	do		sand from the river Delaware.
1,750	do	52,500	bushels coal, chiefly from Virginia.
19,000	do	6,200	cords wood, chiefly from Maine.
28	do	56,000	lbs. saltpetre, imported.
200	do		fire clay, imported.
100	do		of other materials, iron, brass, tin, &c. used for trimmings, all manufactured in the United States, and amounting annually to forty thousand dollars - - $40,000.

The tonnage employed by them annually, for the transportation of the raw materials and fuel, to the factories, is twenty-two thousand five hundred tons, - - - - - - *Tons* 22,500

And is estimated to be equal to the constant employment of seven hundred and fifty tons, *Tons* 750

The tonnage employed for transporting the manufactured glass-ware, to the various markets in the U. States, is four thousand eight hundred tons, measurement,		4,800
Estimated to be equal to the constant employment of four hundred and fifty tons, - - - - -	450	
The glass-ware annually shipped to foreign countries amounts to forty-two thousand dollars, and employs seven hundred tons (measurement) of shipping,		700
Equal to the constant employment of one vessel of one hundred tons - - - - - - - - -	100	
Tons	1,300	28,000

Thus it appears that the two factories employ transiently twenty-eight thousand tons of shipping, which, by an estimate of the length of the voyages coastwise, is equal to the constant employment of thirteen hundred tons of shipping.

The pots used in these factories being somewhat larger than the average size, and a greater proportion of the ware being wrought into articles for *cut-glass*, which, with the cost of trimmings, makes the average amount upwards of fourteen thousand dollars' worth of glass to each pot used, the committee, from the best data they could procure, have estimated that each of the one hundred and twelve pots at the other factories, turns out, annually, about eight thousand dollars,—making together the amount of near nine hundred thousand dollars annually, - - - - - - - - - - - Say $900,000

To which add the product of the two factories named, 400,000

$1,300,000

Making the total amount of flint-glass now made in the United States, equal to thirteen hundred thousand dollars per annum.

The committee find from information received, that the raw materials used in most of the factories is larger in proportion than in the factories named,—because a greater proportion of their wares are of the more common and plain kinds, and not intended for the higher finish by cutting; while in those named the cost of cutting and of trimmings is included. They therefore estimate that the whole quantity of materials consumed in the twenty-one furnaces is equal to

1,450	tons or	2,900,000	lbs. of lead.
900	do	1,800,000	pearl ashes.
2,600	do		sand.
1,000	do		fire-clay.
100	do	200,000	lbs. of saltpetre.

The wood and coal for fuel, and other materials, being in the same proportion between the factories named, and the whole now in the United States, the transportation by land and by water must be in the same proportion also, and employ many thousand tons of shipping, as well as many thousand workmen and labourers, in the various branches of business to provide the raw materials, and the fuel consumed.

The consumption of lead alone is one-sixth part of all that is now made in the country.

The first manufactory of flint-glass, to any considerable extent, in the United States, was established at Pittsburg in 1812, and the next,

near Boston, in 1816; from these the others have sprung up in rapid succession. Previous to the existence of these establishments, the country was supplied with flint-glass principally from England, and, although the price of glassware was then nearly *fifty per cent.* higher than at the present day, yet, owing to the many embarrassments attending the commencement of a new manufacture, and the uncertainty of sales from a variety of causes, great losses were sustained by the proprietors. By the tariff of 1824, the home market was secured to the domestic manufacture—since which the improvements made in the art, the increased skill of the workmen, and the regularity of the demand, have enabled the manufacturers to meet the present reduced prices, (which are fully one-third less than in 1816,) and to obtain a fair remuneration for their investments. The present extent of the manufacture of flint-glass is nearly equal to the consumption of the United States, and may be increased to an indefinite amount. The whole importation of all kinds of glass-ware (other than window-glass) in 1830, according to the treasury report, was $325,000; of this amount, about $75,000 were apothecaries' vials, bottles and demijohns, and of the residue, nearly or quite one-half, it is presumed, consisted of fancy articles from France, and common tumblers from Germany, leaving about $125,000, at the custom house valuation, of English flint-glass-ware, an amount scarcely exceeding the exportation of American flint glass-ware in 1831.

The flint-glass ware still imported from England is principally from New-Castle, and exclusively on the English manufacturers' account, and generally in English vessels, consigned to English agents or houses here, and uniformly forced upon the American market at a loss of from 15 to 25 per cent. upon the lowest price it can be purchased for with cash, by the American merchant, from the English manufacturers; and it is well known that very few, if any, and perhaps not a single order has been sent to England by an American merchant for flint-glass in the last three or four years. It is then fair to presume, that the glass-ware thus imported is either undervalued in the invoices, to lessen the duties established by our laws, or consists of the surplus and refuse stock of the English manufacturers on hand, from time to time, which is shipped to this country for the purpose of receiving the drawback of the excise duty in England, and the bounty, allowed on its exportation.

The present duty here is two cents per pound, and twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

The present excise duty in England is forty-nine shillings sterling per cwt. and, on exportation, the manufacturers receive sixty-one shillings and six pence sterling per cwt. making the bounty on exportation twelve shillings and sixpence sterling per cwt. or about two and three quarter cents on every pound. It might be presumed that the bounty, thus allowed on exportation, was in consideration of a duty, or excise, imposed on the raw materials; the fact however is otherwise—there is no duty in England on the raw materials for the composition of glass, excepting upon pot and pearl ashes from this country, which does not exceed one-quarter of a cent per pound of glass.

The reasons assigned by the English manufacturers why they should be allowed a bounty on exportation was; that the outlay of capital was

oppressively burthened by the levy of the excise which was formerly ninety-eight shillings sterling, and the bounty formerly allowed twenty-five shillings per cwt. In 1825 the excise being reduced to forty-nine shillings, the bounty allowed over and above a drawback of the excise, was also reduced to twelve shillings and sixpence per cwt. which is a clear and actual *bonus* to the English manufacturers of more than two and a half cents on every pound of glass exported, over all duties on the raw materials, leaving the real protection to the American manufacturer by the present tariff, only about sixteen per cent.

It is believed that the American manufacturers are satisfied with the existing duty on imported flint-glass—but should any alteration be deemed necessary, they would prefer that the whole duty on plain glass should be levied specifically on the weight,—which mode would be the fairest, putting at rest any question of fraud upon the revenue, and placing the American importers upon equal ground with the English manufacturers, so far as relates to the duties.

A repeal of the duty on glass, even to the extent of the protection now afforded by the tariff, might not wholly stop the manufacture of it in this country—but a great influx of the foreign article would undoubtedly ensue, and by thus overstocking the market, cause a very great and general distress among the manufacturers, and those possessing but limited means would sink under the pressure: and the ultimate effect would be, to advance the prices of both the foreign and domestic article greatly beyond the present rates, and consequently increase the charge to the consumer.

The committee are aware that there exists in the United States several manufactories of green bottles, demijohns and apothecaries' ware and shop furniture, but they have not been able to procure detailed statements of their extent, except from the large establishment of Dyott, at Kensington, near Philadelphia. "This establishment is on a more extensive scale than any other of the kind in the United States, consisting of four furnaces, melting about 8,000 lbs. per day, averaging about twelve hundred tons per annum, which is blown into apothecaries' phials, bottles, shop furniture, &c. This glass is composed of materials altogether the production of the American soil, and about fifteen thousand barrels of rosin, from North Carolina, are annually consumed as fuel, in preference to wood or coal;—from 250 to 300 men and boys are constantly employed. Previous to the late tariff, this establishment struggled hard for existence, against foreign competition, and was upon the point of being closed,—since its enactment, the importation of foreign glass-ware of this description is nearly suspended: and the prices have been reduced fully *fifty per cent.* and the quality of the ware is at least equal, if not superior, to the foreign manufacture. It is believed that a reduction of the tariff would operate a destruction of this establishment, and, after a short time, produce an increase in the prices of the manufacture, as well as throw out of employ a great number of our fellow citizens."

The committee have not been informed of more than one manufactory of black glass bottles, carboys and demijohns; this is near Boston, employing a capital of fifty thousand dollars, and making six thousand groce of bottles annually, employing sixty-five men and boys, who receive in wages about twenty thousand dollars a year, and consuming annually,

50,000	bushels, or	2,000	tons	of coal, from Virginia.
11,000	do	300	do	wood-ashes, from families.
9,000	do	350	do	leached barilla, from soap factories.
1,450	do	50	do	marine salt.
500	casks	200	do	lime, from Maine.
		50	do	fire clay, imported.
		150	do	clay, from New York.
		75	do	sandstone, from New York.
		500	do	sand, from the sea-shore.
		4,000	crates	for packages, from Maine.

Employing upwards of 4,000 tons of shipping for transportation, equal to 450 tons constantly.

The committee are not advised of more than one manufactory of crown window-glass yet in full operation in the United States, and one recently built in the state of New York.

The New England crown glass manufactory has in operation, near Boston, one furnace with six pots,

Employs a capital of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, $150,000

Manufactures annually, glass to the amount of one hundred thousand dollars, - - - - - - - $100,000

Gives constant employment to fifty-five men and ten boys,

Men and boys, 65

Pays annually, as wages, about twenty-three thousand dollars, - - - - - - - - - - - $23,000

The annual consumption of materials and fuel is as follows, viz:

200,000	lbs. or	100	tons	pearl ashes, mostly from Maine.
12,000	do	6	do	saltpetre, imported.
250	casks, or	100	do	lime, from Maine.
26,000	lbs. or	13	do	dry soda, imported from France.
2,000	do	1	do	refined borax, imported.
		80	do	marine salt.
		150	do	clay, from Europe.
		250	do	sand, from New Jersey.
900	cords, or	2,700	do	wood, from Maine.
65,000	bush. or	2,600	do	coal, from Virginia.

Employing six thousand tons of shipping for the transportation of materials and fuel to the factory, equal to the constant employment of three hundred and fifty tons.

The committee are advised of the existence of twenty-three manufactories of cylinder window-glass in the United States, viz:

At	Chelmsford, Mass. - - - - - -	1
	Keene, N. H. - - - - - - -	1
	Burlington, Vt. - - - - - -	1
	Wellington, Con. - - - - - -	1
	Geneva, N. Y. - - - - - -	1
	Hamilton, N. Y. - - - - - - -	1
	Pittsburg, Pa. - - - - - - -	4
	Brownsville, Pa. - - - - - - -	4
	Baltimore, Md. - - - - - -	1
	Cumberland, Md. - - - - - -	1
	Washington, D. C. - - - - - -	1
	Wheeling, Va. - - - - - - -	2

Zanesville, Ohio, - - - - - - 1
Moscow, Ohio, - - - - - - - 1
Williamsport, Pa. - - - - - - 1
Geneva, Pa. - - - - - - - 1

It is believed there are several others, but no information of their location has been received.

The committee have not obtained a detailed statement of the extent of these manufactories of cylinder window-glass, except in the following single instance:

At Chelmsford, Mass. one furnace with two pots employs a capital of thirty thousand dollars, - - - - - - - $30,000
Pays in wages annually to thirty-five men in the factory, 10,000
Manufactures annually, seven thousand five hundred boxes of glass amounting to - - - - - - - 37,000
And consumes annually,
2,000 cords of wood, as fuel.
150 tons of sand, from New Jersey.
50 do pot ashes, from Maine and Vermont.
25 do saltpetre, imported.
75 do lime, from Maine.
30 do wood-ashes.
12 do fire clay, imported.

The committee have no data to determine whether the extent of this factory is a fair average of the whole number, many of them are known to be more extensive, but estimating the others by this one, it follows that the twenty-three cylinder glass factories employs as capital, - - - - - - - - - $690,000
Pay annually in wages, - - - - - - - 230,000
Give employment to eight hundred men - - *Men*, 800
Produce in window-glass, 172,500 boxes, or 8,625,000 sq. ft. amounting in value to - - - - - - - $851,000

Thus the whole amount of glass now annually manufactured in the United States is at least of

Flint glass-ware, - - - - - - - - 1,300,000
Glass bottles, phials, apothecaries' ware, demijohns, carboys, &c. - - - - - - - - 200,000
Crown window-glass, - - - - - - 150,000
Cylinder window-glass, - - - - - - 851,000

Making a total of - - - - - $2,501,00
The whole number of workmen employed in the manufacture of glass must exceed eighteen hundred, - - - 1,800
The amount of wages paid is equal to - - - $690,000
Subsisting a population of nine thousand persons, - - 9,000

The committee have not been advised of the extent of two or three manufactures of porcelain; these are yet in their infancy, and are contending with the many obstacles which are consequent to new undertakings of this kind. The materials for the composition of this article are abundant in the country, and many years cannot elapse before it forms an important item of domestic manufacture, nor have they been able to collect detailed statements of other manufactures from clay; these are very numerous, and scattered over the whole country—but

their extent, the amount of capital or number of hands employed, or the aggregate amount of their products, cannot be ascertained, without great labour, and much time, which the committee have not been able to devote to this branch of their inquiries.

All which is respectfully submitted.

A. BINNEY,
For the committee.

Boston, February 13, 1832.

APPENDIX BY THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE.

Mr. F. Lorenz, at Pittsburg, has three glass houses, making monthly, at each—

1,500 boxes window-glass, 100 feet each,
1,000 dollars' worth of hollow ware,
Employing 102 hands—
Consuming annually— 7,000 cords wood,
700 tons sand,
1,000 bbls. salt,
40,000 lbs. scorch'd salts, or potash,
150,000 bushels coal,
With ashes, lime, &c. &c.

Cost for labor about 2,500 dollars a month—"or double the amount paid in England, and three times the amount paid in Germany, for making the same quantity." But "glass (green) sells now for about *one-third* to *one-half* the price that it did during the war."

Mr. Lorenz also mentions the following glass houses in "this vicinity"—at Birmingham, New Geneva, New Albany, Bridgeport and Perrypolis, one each, and two at Williamsport, one of hollow ware, making 3,500 dollars' worth, monthly; each of which, Mr. L. observes, may be estimated as about the same in produce as each of his own. And Mr. Bakewell estimates the value of the window glass and bottles made at, and in the neighborhood of Pittsburg, at more than 500,000 dollars a year.

Another glass factory is reported at Brownsville, making about 20,000 dollars worth annually.

On the whole, it seems quite reasonable to believe, that the value of the glass manufactured in the United States, is $3,000,000
The amount of persons employed, - - - is *no.* 2,140
Do do subsisted, - - *no.* 10,800
Do wages annually paid, - - dolls. 720,000

And this pleasing fact is manifest—that, while the workmen obtain high wages, by which they and their families are plentifully and comfortably subsisted, there has been a general decline in the selling price of glass, as compared with what it was before protection was afforded to this interesting manufacture, of about 50 *per centum*. And further, that a large part of the materials used would have had but a small value, *if any value at all*, except because of these factories, in many places.

In the preceding amounts of persons employed or subsisted, or wages paid, no regard is had to the very numerous individuals employed by, or making profit upon the supply or preparation of materials, in the

transportation of them, by land or water, to the factories, or in the carriage of the articles made to the markets for them—the value of all which must be much larger than the sum paid to workmen employed in the manufacture itself—which probably subsists, directly and indirectly, not less than 25,000 persons—affording for the whole an average annual value of 120 dollars each, including, of course, interest on capital earned.

MANUFACTURE OF CABINET WARE.

The committee to whom was referred the subject of manufacture of cabinet ware, and the materials employed in the same, Report—

That from the limited time for making the necessary enquiries, (as the article is manufactured in almost every part of the United States), they find it impossible to offer such a report as might be conclusive. But from the best information they have been able to obtain,—they give the following as the result:

That from the encouragement already afforded by the protecting system, which gives a fair competition with the imported article, the latter has been almost entirely excluded from our market. The article is now manufactured at 30 *per cent. less*, than for the several years past.

It is ascertained, from statistical examination, that there is manufactured in the United States to the amount of $10,000,000

Foreign materials, on which duty is paid	800,000
Foreign and domestic, on which duty is not paid	4,500,000
Number of men employed	15,000
Amount paid for labor	4,700,000

The article, has become one of considerable export. It is carried in American ships to Canton, in China, South America and the West Indies. There are also a number of vessels, from our principal ports, constantly employed in bringing mahogany to this country.

It has also become one of the principal articles of the manufactures of the country, for the employment of vessels in our coasting trade.

Under the existing duty, the committee are satisfied, that this branch of our manufactures will continue to be prosecuted to advantage, to all engaged therein; as also to the interest of the country at large.

They therefore hope, that no diminution of the present duty may be made, as, under the present protection, it affords only a moderate compensation to the manufacturer—the domestic competition reducing profits to the lowest point at which the manufacture can be sustained. Should, however, any reduction be made—the business will be, in a great measure, abandoned, because of the want of certainty in the market, and that distress ensue to the poorer classes of citizens employed, that has already been mentioned in the report on the subject of the manufacture of hats.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARKSON CROLIUS, *Chairman.*

NEW YORK, Nov. 1, 1831.

MEMORIAL

OF THE

NEW-YORK CONVENTION,

TO THE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Presented March 26, 1832, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

In Convention of the Friends of Domestic Industry Assembled at New York, Oct. 26, 1831.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to prepare a memorial to Congress, enforcing the propriety of continuing the protection of our domestic industry,—whatever reduction of duties may be expedient on articles not conflicting with that industry.

Referred to a committee of one from each state—Mr. Wingate, of New Hampshire, Mr. Richards, of Vermont, Mr. A. H. Everett, of Massachusetts, (*chairman,*) Mr. Cozzens, of Rhode Island, Mr. Sherwood, of Connecticut, Mr. Buel, of New York, Mr. Darcey, of New Jersey, Mr. Hemphill, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Dupont of Delaware, Mr. Tiernan, of Maryland, and Mr. Green, of Ohio.

BOSTON, *March* 19, 1832.

SIR: I have the honor to send you enclosed, a memorial to Congress, prepared by order of a Convention held at New York in October last, which you would oblige me by presenting to the House of Representatives. I am, with great respect, sir,

Your very obedient servant,

A. H. EVERETT.

Honourable ANDREW STEVENSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

The memorial of a Convention of Friends of Domestic Industry assembled at New York, on the 25th of October last,

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

That, having been deputed by a large number of their fellow citizens in all parts of the country to meet together, and adopt such measures as might appear suitable for the encouragement of domestic industry, they have deemed it their duty to address themselves to your honorable body, and to state their views upon the economical condition and policy

of the country. Belonging, for the most part, to a class of the people whose interests are directly involved in the measures that may be taken by the Government in regard to this subject, their opinions are in general the results of their own experience; and they venture to solicit for them the attention which may be due from enlightened legislators to the observations and conclusions of practical men.

The leading object of your memorialists, in the present communication, is to pray your honorable body to continue the duties on imported foreign articles which were intended for the protection of domestic manufactures, whatever reduction it may be found expedient to make in the duties on such imported foreign articles as do not enter into competition with the products of our own industry. The crisis in the financial situation of the government, which will be the effect of the approaching extinction of the public debt, will render it practicable, and consequently proper, to reduce, very considerably, the amount of the revenue; but, your memorialists believe that this reduction may be made, and that regard for the welfare of the country imperiously requires that it should be made, without infringing on the principle of protection. In support of this opinion, they respectfully submit the following suggestions.

Your memorialists are aware that it has been sometimes questioned, whether the government of the United States possesses, under the constitution, the right of imposing duties on foreign imported articles for the purpose of protecting domestic manufactures; but they deem it unnecessary to enter at large at present upon the discussion of this point. Their views respecting it are fully stated in their address to the people of the United States, to which they respectfully solicit your attention. They consider it as well established, by the facts and arguments contained in that address, that the protection of domestic industry, by the imposition of duties on foreign articles, which are or may be abundantly produced in this country, was one of the main objects which the people of the United States had in view in forming and adopting the federal constitution; that the constitution expressly confers upon the government the power of laying duties at discretion for any purpose which they may deem conducive to the general welfare, and particularly for that of regulating commerce; that the language of the preamble of the first revenue act, and the uniform practice of the government ever since, prove that the powers conferred by the constitution were understood by the framers of that instrument, and by all their distinguished successors in the administration, and in Congress, up to the present day, to include that of imposing duties on imported foreign articles for the purpose of protecting domestic industry. The correctness of these opinions is also admitted by many of the most intelligent and enlightened of those persons who doubt the expediency of the protecting policy! Of the very respectable assembly of delegates from this class of the citizens who met at Philadelphia last year, a large proportion were so fully satisfied of the constitutionality of this policy, that it is understood that they were prepared to retire from the Convention rather than give their assent to any expression of a contrary opinion. The memorial to your honorable body, which has been submitted by a committee of that convention, waives any objection on that ground; and some of the ablest writers in opposition to the protecting policy, have recently declared their decided belief in its constitutionality, which is thus confirmed, to a very great extent, by the strongest of all arguments—the

assent of persons having an adverse interest. Under these circumstances, your memorialists cannot regard the constitutional right of the government to impose duties on imported foreign articles for the protection of domestic industry, as a doubtful question; nor, if it were, would they wish to add any thing on this occasion to the expression of their views upon this subject contained in the address to the people. Without dwelling on this topic, they proceed, therefore, at once to offer some considerations in support of the expediency of the protecting policy, and in answer to the objections that are urged against it.

In restricting themselves to this division of the subject, your memorialists are well aware that they still have before them a topic much too vast to be treated satisfactorily within the limits that are assigned by usage to an exposition of this description. They can only hope to touch very briefly upon some of the most important general principles connected with the inquiry. A minute investigation of details would carry them too far, and would also be, as they conceive, irrelevant to the present purpose. The settlement of the precise form in which the protecting principle, if maintained, is to be applied, belongs to a different order of researches, into which, at present, your memorialists have no occasion or disposition to enter. These points will naturally be regulated, from time to time, as circumstances may require, by the wisdom of successive legislatures. The great question which now engages the attention of the country, is simply this: Shall the government maintain or abandon the protecting principle? This must be decided on large and general views of the past history, the present situation, and the future prospects of the Union. It is not exclusively, as some suppose, a question of the actual and possible prices of articles, although the effect of protecting duties or prices, is no doubt included in the inquiry. It involves, besides, a consideration of the causes that promote the welfare of nations, by determining their progress in population, civilization, and political power, as well as mere wealth. It has indeed been one of the errors of the opponents of the protecting policy, that they have looked too directly and exclusively at the supposed effect of this policy on prices; although in regard to these, they are, as your memorialists conceive, entirely mistaken, and have not sufficiently regarded its operation on the great and permanent interests of the people, considered as a community. It is to these that your memorialists propose, at present, more particularly to request your attention.

The general object of a protecting policy, is the encouragement of domestic industry in all its great branches, agriculture and commerce, as well as manufactures. Its direct and immediate application varies according to the geographical characteristics and peculiar circumstances under which it is applied. In this country, it was deemed important forty years ago to protect the culture of cotton, by a duty of three cents a pound on the foreign article, and to encourage our own navigation by discriminating tonnage and light duties, amounting to a dollar a ton on foreign ships. Whatever may be the product or branch of industry which is the immediate object of protection in the first instance, it confers, in its general results, an equal and common benefit upon the whole community, because the extension of industry in one of its departments, naturally creates a corresponding extension in all the rest. Under the present circumstances of the country, manufactures and the agricultural products that are employed in them, such as wool, iron, hemp, and flax, are regarded as among the pro-

per objects of the protecting policy, and, in most discussions of the subject for practical purposes, the inquiry turns upon the expediency of protecting and encouraging domestic manufactures by duties on the corresponding foreign articles. It is generally acknowledged alike by the friends and the opponents of the protecting policy, that our domestic manufactures would not flourish, or even exist without protection. If they could, the protecting duty would be nugatory and merely nominal, as that on cotton in fact is. Whenever the protection is real and operative, it is of course necessary to the existence of the manufacture. The question of the expediency of protection, resolves itself, therefore, into the question of the advantage of possessing domestic manufactures. It is admitted that we cannot possess manufactures and the benefits they bring with them, without protecting duties; and, in order to be able to judge whether the protecting policy be expedient or not, we must inquire what advantages the country will derive from possessing manufactures. By comparing these with the sacrifices, if any, imposed by the protecting policy, it will be easy to see whether the expected benefit is worth what it costs.

It may be proper to remark here, that the necessity of legislative protection to the prosperity and even existence of our manufactures, is not the result of any deficiency in this country of natural advantages for the prosecution of this branch of industry. No community perhaps on the globe is, in this respect, better situated than the United States of America. The vast extent of our territory, stretching as it does through a great many different climates, furnishes an inexhaustible supply of materials of every description, the boundless abundance and variety of which we are ourselves scarcely beginning to realize. Forty years ago, it was not known that cotton would grow in any part of our soil; it now forms the staple product of six States, besides the territory of Florida, and supplies, in addition to our own demand, two-thirds of all that is used in other countries. It is only since its cession to the United States, in 1803, that the soil of Louisiana has been turned to account for the production of sugar. It already furnishes, under the encouragement of a judicious protecting duty, an annual product of sixty million pounds, and bids fair, at no distant period, to supply the whole consumption of the Union. Within a very few years, we have discovered the gold mines of North Carolina and Georgia, —have begun to appreciate the great value of those of lead in the Upper Mississippi, and have brought into use the still more precious treasure of our coals. Silk is becoming very fast an object of attention. Such, in short, is the richness and variety of our natural products, that hardly any considerable manufacture can be named, for which we do not possess the principal materials within ourselves. Next to an abundant supply of materials, the most important requisite for success in manufactures, is an easy communication by means of water courses, roads, and accessible harbors between the different sections of the same country, and with foreign parts. Here, again, our situation is unrivalled. In no region of equal extent, are the facilities for intercourse by land and water so abundant. Our sea coast of fifteen hundred miles, with the bays and rivers that indent it, lays open the interior as far back as the mountains, to the access of foreign and internal trade. Beyond the mountains, again, the magnificent chain of lakes and rivers that extends, with its countless ramifications, from the gulf of St. Lawrence to that of Mexico, seems, if we look only at the natural means of communication, to bring them almost to the door of every citizen. To

these, we may already add the numerous canals that do so much honor to the enterprise of several of the States, and in a pretty near prospect, the rail-roads, of which the results are so extraordinary, that we can hardly yet trust ourselves to calculate on them, although we see them realised before our eyes. In the last and principal requisite for success in manufactures, which is to be found in the intellectual and moral qualities of the people, the United States may fairly claim at least an equality with other countries. It would, in fact, be doing injustice to our intelligent and enterprising citizens, not to admit that, as a community, they have shown a peculiar aptitude for making discoveries and improvements in the mechanical arts. The world owes to them a large proportion of the remarkable inventions of the last half century, of which the cotton-gin, the steamboat, the nail and card machines, are only the most prominent among hundreds of others of less note. It is hardly necessary to add that the moral qualities that distinguish our population—their general uprightness in dealing, steady industry in pursuit of their respective callings, and habitual practice of all the domestic virtues, eminently qualify them to turn their natural and intellectual advantages to the best account; while the transcendant blessing of our excellent political institutions, by securing to every citizen the full and unmolested enjoyment of fruits of his labor, and opening the whole field of wealth and distinction to his honourable ambition, supplies the motive to exertion, without which the happiest natural gifts are often permitted to rest unused. We should prove ourselves ungrateful to the Bounteous Giver of all these blessings, not to perceive in them a combination of advantages, physical and moral, for the prosecution of every department of labor, including all the liberal and mechanical arts in the widest comprehension of the terms, such as has rarely, if ever, fallen to the lot of any other people.

Your memorialists have deemed it not irrelevant to the present purpose to dwell a little upon the great natural advantages possessed by the United States for the prosecution of all the branches of industry, and especially manufactures, inasmuch as it would be impolitic and unavailing to attempt to encourage, by legislative protection, pursuits which were interdicted by the nature of the soil or climate, or the character of the people. Such, however, is not the case. It is not owing to the absence of natural advantages for the prosecution of manufactures, that this branch of industry requires at present to be fostered and secured from foreign competition by legislative protection. Various circumstances in the past history of the United States, which are too familiarly known to call for more than a passing allusion on this occasion, have naturally led to this result. It was a part of the old colonial system to prohibit the colonies altogether from engaging in manufactures. Even Lord Chatham, the political friend of America, and, in many respects, a more enlightened and liberal statesman than many of his contemporaries, declared, in open Parliament, that, if he could help it, there should not be a hob-nail manufactured in America. This continued till the war of independence. The period of exhaustion, poverty, political imbecility, and partial confusion which followed the peace, was not very favorable to the formation of economical establishments of any kind. Scarcely had the adoption of the federal constitution introduced some degree of confidence, and the continuance of peace permitted the accumulation of a moderate capital, when the breaking out of the war in Europe, threw into the hands of our merchants the carrying trade of the

world, and thus offered an irresistible bounty on the investment of capital in commerce. It accordingly took that direction almost exclusively, and with great profit to the country, uutil the commencement of the commercial restrictions in 1807. These, and the war with England which succeeded, diverted capital from commerce, and threw it into the channel of manufactures, which accordingly sprung up and flourished with great vigor. It thus appears that, from the period of the first settlement of the country till the commencement of the late difficulties with England, there was always some particular cause in operation, the effect of which was adverse to the establishment of manufactures. The impulse which was given to them by these difficulties was again checked for a time by the return of peace, and the importation of the flood of British products which were thrown in for this express purpose. It has since recovered itself, and, with the aid of the protection afforded by the successive tariffs of 1816, 1824, and 1828, has been gradually and regularly gaining strength. No particular obstacle now opposes the developement of this branch of industry, which on the other hand, is favored by the present state of foreign commerce, and the payment of the public debt. Under these circumstances, new manufacturing establishments are forming; flourishing and populous villages are rising in various quarters; the fairest prospects of future prosperity are opening upon us: but all this admirable creation is still in infancy. These young establishments cannot yet contend with the practised skill and accumulated capital of European industry, still less, with the tremenduous fluctuations to which the state of that industry is subject. It is admitted by all, as your memorialists have already remarked, that, without protection, our manufactures cannot exist. It is the object of the opponents of the protecting policy, by gradually withdrawing this protection, to bring them by a slow process, with as little injury as possible to vested interests, to destruction. Excepting, as far as this is accomplished, the repeal of the protecting duties would work no change in the condition of any portion of the country. It would neither increase the sales of agricultural produce in foreign countries, the importation of foreign manufactures from abroad, nor the amount of navigation employed in bringing them home. Is it desirable that the existing manufacturing establishments of the country should be destroyed, and the present prospects of future progress in this branch of industry blasted? What is the operation of domestic manufactures on the wealth, population, and general prosperity of a country? Is it favorable, injurious, or simply indifferent? If favorable, is there any thing in the operation of the protecting policy which tends to counteract their good results, and to what extent? These are the questions which appear to your memorialists to be the leading ones in the present inquiry, and which they will now briefly attempt to resolve.

The time has been, and it is not a very remote one, when the question, whether the operation of domestic manufactures is or is not injurious, would have been readily answered by many persons in this country in the affirmative. They were habitually viewed with distrust, as likely to exercise a pernicious influence on the morals of the persons employed in them. In the earlier discussions of the protecting policy in Congress, and up to the period immediately preceding the war, this was the argument principally urged in opposition to it, and it was urged with peculiar zeal by the representatives of the eastern states. Experience has since corrected this error, and has shown that, in well-managed manufacturing establishments, the

only ones which can long thrive, and which, of course, determine the average condition of the whole, the standard of morals is as high, if not higher, than it is in those belonging to any other branch of industry, not excepting agriculture in its best estate. The same experience has amply demonstrated the great positive advantages resulting from the possession of domestic manufactures, the most important of which your memorialists will now very briefly recapitulate.

The first and principal one is an accession of wealth, population, and political importance, exactly proportioned to the whole amount of capital, and the whole number of persons which they employ. This proposition may appear at first so trite and obvious as to be nearly or quite self-evident. That an agricultural village, town, and country, which obtains its supplies of manufactured articles within its own limits, is, in the same proportion more wealthy, populous, and flourishing, than one, in other respects similarly situated, which sends for them to a distant city, is a truth too familiar to every one from actual observation, to be made the subject of question. It is also apparent that the remark is equally true of communities politically independent. But, as this truth, however obvious, is constantly denied by the opponents of the protecting policy, and as the denial of it forms the first step in most of the reasoning by which they endeavour to support their opinions, it may be proper to dwell upon it for a few moments, for the purpose of stating it in a more precise form, and examining the objections that are alleged against it.

It may be remarked then, that, in every community, the wants of the people are regularly supplied by the co-operation of the three great branches of industry, agriculture, commerce and manufactures, in proportions determined by the degree of civilization. The three classes of laborers who are respectively engaged in these three different employments, all derive their means of subsistence, and the manufacturers their materials, from the products of agriculture, and must receive their share alike, whether they dwell within or without the country. If they live abroad, they still consume the same amount as before, of the products of the community for which they work, and the wealth and population of the latter are of coure regularly smaller in the same proportion. If it be supposed, for example—and such is nearly the case in the wealthy and civilized parts of the Christian world—that these three classes of laborers are regularly equal in number, then a community which receives its manufactures from abroad will regularly export one-third part of its agricultural produce in exchange for them, and will be one-third less wealthy and populous, than it would be if they were all supplied at home. Besides this, the labor required for exchanging the products of the two classes of workmen now belonging to distinct communities, regularly divides itself between those communities, and the agricultural country will thus sustain the loss of half its commercial, in addition to the whole of its manufacturing population. The distance at which the exchanges are made being now greater, it requires a greater amount of labor than before to effect them; or, in other words, to carry on the necessary commerce; so that, if this branch of industry before occupied a third part of the laborers, it will now occupy more. On this first and simplest view of the effect on a community of the absence of domestic manufactures, there is, therefore, a loss of more than half the wealth and population that naturally belong to it. But the wealth and population of every country form the true measures of its general

prosperity and political importance; and a community which receives its manufactures from abroad, sustains, therefore, in each of these respects, a positive loss of half its natural advantages. But this is not all. The wealth and population thus lost, go to swell the wealth and population of some other country, of necessity, one with which the losing people have a close relation. If the elements of wealth and power belonging to the countries thus situated, be, in other respects, naturally equal, one now gains, and the other loses more than half the amount, and the relative forces of the two become as three to one. Thus, the want of domestic manufactures deprives a country of half its positive, and two-thirds of its relative importance; degrades it of course from its rank among the nations, and places it at the mercy of the powers with which it has the closest connexion, and to which it is naturally equal.

It is said, however, on the other hand, that the foreign manufactures which we obtain from abroad in exchange for our agricultural exports, are as much the products of American industry as if they were made at home, and that they, of course, put in motion an equal amount of American capital and labor. The friends of the protecting policy are told "that the erroneous doctrines prevalent respecting the injurious consequence of the importation of foreign goods arise, chiefly, from overlooking this leading principle, viz. If we buy, we must pay for what we buy; if we import foreign goods, we must export domestic products, or something for which domestic products are exchanged, to pay for these foreign goods;" and it is candidly added, that "these truths are every day denied by men who have an interest in imposing upon the public." We are told again, on higher authority, that, "as every article imported must be purchased, and cannot be paid for by any possible means other than the products of American industry, it necessarily follows, that whatever may be the amount of imports, and of foreign industry, by which they may have been produced, an equal value of American products, and an equal amount of corresponding American industry is employed by the foreign trade." "The error of the restrictionists," as a majority of the people of the United States are politely and elegantly styled, is said to consist "in not perceiving that the foreign trade promotes [*puts in motion*] two equal amounts of foreign and domestic industry, which, in the establishment of a new manufacture, is substituted to [*for*] the foreign industry, is an addition to, instead of being a deduction from, the American industry, which was, or might have been, otherwise employed."

In reference to these and other suggestions of a similar import, your memorialists beg your honorable body to be assured, that they have not, as is supposed, overlooked the very obvious fact that no foreign article can be imported excepting in exchange for a domestic one of equal value. They are well aware that, in general, all commerce, whether between nations or individuals, consists in an exchange of equal values. They also readily admit that the foreign product thus obtained in exchange for the imported domestic one, may itself be regarded without impropriety, when brought into market as an American product, and as having given employment to American labor and capital. But it is not the less certain that the exported and the imported article cannot both be considered as the products of American labor and capital. If a planter, who exchanges a bale of cotton for a bale of broadcloth, choose to consider and represent the latter, when brought into the home market, as his product, he may do

so without impropriety; but in that case he must consider and represent his cotton as the product of the British manufacturer. When two countries exchange their products, it is apparent that each can only be regarded as the producer of one of the products so exchanged; and it is of no consequence to the present question, whether they are regarded as producing respectively their exports or their imports. On the other hand, when the exchange takes place in the same country, it is equally clear that both the products exchanged are domestic, and that the operation sets in motion exactly twice the amount of domestic industry and capital which is put in motion by the other.

Your memorialists will add here, that they have no dispositon to impeach the motives of such of their fellow citizens as may differ from them in opinion upon these important subjects. They believe that while self-interest is one of the motives that operate on both sides of this, as of all other questions, there is also on both sides a large, perhaps an equal, proportion of patriotic feeling, and honest intention to promote the public good. But as the character of their own motives is pretty freely handled in some of the above extracts, they may perhaps be permitted to say that the *foreign origin* of the doctrine they are noticing, in the most imposing form in which it has yet appeared, is apparent on its face as quoted above, and that a foreign origin not unfrequently indicates a foreign interest. The British, the French, and the Swiss manufacturer would gladly persuade us, and have an interest in persuading us, that we lose nothing by consuming their products instead of our own; but it is plain, that if the American cultivator give a product upon which he has employed a certain amount of labor and capital to an American manufacturer, in exchange for an American product which has employed another equal amount of American labor and capital, the operation puts in motion twice as much American labor and capital as if he gave the same product to a foreign manufacturer, in exchange for a foreign product which has employed an equal amount of foreign labor and capital. The point is too clear to admit of argument, and yet we are told that the error of the "*restrictionists* consists in not perceiving that the foreign trade promotes, (puts in motion,) two equal amounts of foreign and domestic industry." The friends of the protecting policy know very well that the foreign trade puts in motion two equal amounts of industry, one foreign and the other domestic; but, though emphatically charged with *blindness*, they cannot help seeing that the internal trade puts in motion two equal amounts of industry, both of which are domestic; and that it employs, of course, twice as much domestic labor and capital as the other.

It is said, again, that the whole capital of every community is at all times employed; that the establishment of manufactures can only be effected by withdrawing from agriculture or commerce a portion of the capital that was previously employed in them; and that, as the reward of labor is equal in all its departments, the community gains nothing by the operation, and of course loses to the full extent of any sacrifice that may have been made for the purpose of effecting it. "Legislation," we are informed on respectable authority, "cannot generate the smallest amount of capital, it can only transfer the capital already existing from one employment to another." It is said to be "obvious that a certain amount of American industry, which, was or might have been employed in producing one million of dollars worth of articles intended for exportation, and to be exchanged for an

equal value of foreign goods, cannot, if employed in a domestic manufacture of goods of a similar nature, be any longer employed in producing the exportable articles; and that the only question is, whether that amount of industry is more or less profitably employed in its new, than its former employments." This, as your memorialists conceive, is the radical error in the theory of the opponents of the protecting policy, and it appears to them not less obvious than it is important. It is no doubt perfectly true, that a portion of capital which *was, or might have been*, employed in one branch of domestic industry, cannot, in general, be rendered more productive by being transferred to another. But how does it appear that the capital and labor which are put in motion by the establishment of manufactures in a country where they did not exist before, *was, or might have been*, employed in some other way? How does it appear that all the capital and labor of every community are, at all times, employed in such a way as to yield the ordinary return? Many persons of great discretion believe, that there is in most, if not in all countries, at all times, what has been contemptuously called an *imaginary dormant capital;* in other words, that a certain portion of the capital and labor of almost every community, is at all times either unemployed, or not employed so as to yield the ordinary returns. A circumstance which renders practicable the introduction of a new branch of industry that did not exist before, by stimulating enterprise, has a tendency to bring this dormant capital into activity. We are assured, in fact, on authority which will not be contested by the opponents of the protecting policy, "that, by multiplying in any country the channels of domestic industry, a greater scope is given to its application, a market more diversified and less likely to be glutted procured to its products, and a larger field opened to every species of skill and labor." Now, an act of legislation which counteracts the danger of foreign competition, is precisely one of those circumstances that multiply the channels of industry. Such an act renders it practicable to invest in manufactures capital and labor which would not otherwise have been employed in that way, and, of course, has a tendency to bring into action a portion of capital and labor existing in the country, which was not, and, even if it might, would not have been employed in any other manner. It is admitted, that the female labor employed in the cotton and woollen manufactures, is an example of a result of this description, although, at the same time, the importance of this particular branch of employment is studiously underrated. Your memorialists have no disposition to exaggerate it. They deem it, in fact, themselves, a comparatively insignificant item in the great sum of national industry. They remark, however, in order to set the matter right, that the number of females so employed, at present, is calculated at not less than 100,000. Most of them are the daughters of the cultivators living in the neighborhood of the manufactories in which they are employed, and, if not employed in this way, would have had no occupation whatever of a lucrative kind. They now earn, we are told, from three to four dollars a week, but if we calculate the average earnings of all, over what they would have gained in their former situations, at only $100 a year, we have already, from this single source, a clear addition to the annual revenue of the community of ten million dollars. The profit derived by the country, merely from the female labor which is brought into action by the protecting policy, trifling as it is represented, and comparatively speaking undoubtedly is, nevertheless equal, very nearly, the annual expenses of the government. In connexion

with the remarks on female labor here alluded to, an attempt is made to estimate the total value of all the profits accruing to the country from the encouragement afforded to our domestic industry by the establishment of manufactures. We are told that, "making the most ample allowance for errors or omissions, it is utterly impossible, on any rational and candid calculation, to swell their aggregate value to an amount approaching the national loss arising from a difference of 20 per cent. between the respective prices of the domestic and similar foreign commodities." A very easy calculation, founded on data furnished on the same authority on which this assertion is made, will show how far it is consistent with facts. The total value of manufactures, foreign and domestic, annually consumed in this country is estimated, on this authority, at about $200,000,000. The supposed national loss, resulting from the rise of 20 per cent. in the prices of these occasioned by a duty on foreign goods to that amount, cannot be felt on the whole, because it is admitted that the duty on coarse cottons, the most extensive branch of our domestic manufactures, is nominal. But admitting that the supposed loss is felt on the whole, the amount will be only forty millions, while the single unimportant item, in the profit side of the female labor employed in the manufactories, covers a quarter of that sum.

It appears, therefore, that the *dormant capital* of the country is not so entirely imaginary, nor yet so completely insignificant, as some have supposed. The whole amount of this dormant capital, wherever it may be, which is thus brought into action, may be regarded as a real addition to the previously existing capital of the country, resulting from the establishment of manufactures, and from the protecting policy which rendered that establishment practicable. But let it be admitted, for argument's sake—for the case is so strong as to allow almost any concession not inconsistent with leading and permanent principles—let it be admitted that the notion of a dormant or unemployed capital is entirely imaginary, that the capital and population of all countries must be supposed to be always fully employed, the stock all producing the ordinary returns, the laborers all earning the ordinary wages—how does it appear that, even on this supposition, the capital and labor which are put in motion by the establishment of manufactures, were, or might have been, employed in some other way? In every flourishing country, there is a constant increase of population and accumulation of profits, or, in other words, a constant formation of fresh amounts of capital and labor. This is the fund which regularly furnishes the capital and labor for all new establishments, agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial. We are told, in fact, on authority which will not be questioned by the opponents of the protecting policy, that "it is generally true, that there is a sufficient amount of capital and labor applicable to manufactures, *without withdrawing any that was previously actually employed* in agriculture, commerce, or mechanical pursuits. For, though there may be in certain parts of the country instances of that kind, yet, considered on the whole, there is not, notwithstanding the numerous recent manufacturing establishments, any diminution in the agriculture, foreign commerce, or domestic exports; nor is it necessary, in order to explain this state of things, to recur either to an imaginary dormant capital, or to a pretended creation of capital by banks or legislative acts. Every year adds 150,000 able-bodied men to the labor of the country. The whole population is most active and enterprising, and a great majority engaged in active and profitable pursuits, and continuing to make large annual additions

to the capital." The capital which is put in motion by the establishment of manufactures, is therefore not withdrawn from other employments, but is furnished by the increase that regularly takes place in every flourishing community. That this increase, if not taken up by manufactures, *might be* employed in some other way, is a mere baseless assumption. This would doubtless sometimes happen. In the particular case of the United States, it is probably true that a part of the labor and capital now employed in manufactures would, if they had never existed, have been employed in clearing wild land, and in regard to this portion, the only question is, which of the two employments is the more conducive to the general good? —a point on which your memorialists will presently make some remarks. But the general rule is, that, in regard to capital and labor as to every thing else, the supply follows the demand. And this rule is recognized by the authority just quoted, which repeatedly alludes to "the proportion between supply and demand," as one of the two principal circumstances that regulate the price of labor. We find, accordingly, that wherever new fields for employment are opened, whether by the improvement of methods, the discovery of mines and fisheries, the admission to branches of commerce that were previously closed, the acquisition of territory, the establishment of manufactures, or in whatever other way, they immediately attract to the quarter where they are situated, the capital and labor that are wanted for exploring them. It is in this manner that countries where industry is protected by a wise and vigorous course of legislation, and which consequently offer the strongest encouragement to all kinds of enterprise, gradually concentrate a large portion of the floating capital in existence, and become, for the time, the banks and treasuries, as well as the moral and political guides, of the civilized world. The legislation that leads to such results, makes a real addition to the wealth, as well as to the greatness, glory, and happiness of nations, and may be said, with perfect propriety, to *create* or *generate* capital. If this be the case, it is surely idle to say, that such legislation can never be the immediate occasion of any positive addition to the capital of the country.

It is said, however, that if foreign manufactures can be sold cheaper than similar articles made at home, there will, of course, be an advantage in consuming them equivalent to the difference of prices. We are told that "if a given amount of labor and capital produce, in the same time, a less quantity of a certain commodity than could have been produced in the same time by the same amount of capital and labor, there has been a misapplication of such capital and labor, and a *national loss* equal to the difference between the quantity produced and that which might have been purchased with the proceeds of the same capital and labor otherwise applied." And we are further told, that "there is not the slightest difference in the result, whether the cheaper article was manufactured in the district where the new undertaker resided, or whether it was imported either from another district of the same country or from a foreign country. In each case, it is again self-evident that the national loss is precisely the same." And, again: "There cannot be a plainer matter of fact, than that if a man pays two dollars more for his coat, his plough, or the implements of his trade, because they are of domestic manufacture, it is a loss to him which he must pay out of the proceeds of his industry, and that the aggregate of these individual losses is a *national loss*."

The case here supposed, in which the imported foreign article is cheap-

er than the domestic one, is, as your memorialists conceive, not of natural occurrence, excepting when, as at present in this country, the domestic manufacture is still in its infancy. Where it is well established, and the circumstances of the country are adapted to it, it must always in the end be cheaper than the foreign one, because this will always be charged with the additional expense of transportation from abroad. But supposing even that the price of the domestic manufacture is permanently higher than that of the foreign one, it is far from being true, that such a state of things is always attended with a proportional loss. The belief that it is, is a consequence of the erroneous opinion which has just been exposed, viz. that the establishment of manufactures merely transfers capital from one employment to another, but occasions no addition to the whole capital of a country. If, as your memorialists trust has been satisfactorily shown, the reverse of this be true; if the opening of any new branch of industry, and, in particular, the establishment of manufactures, do in fact make a real and positive addition to the wealth of a nation; it is evident that when the domestic manufacture is dearer than the foreign one, the loss incurred in purchasing the former is counterbalanced by the profit accruing to the community, and that the result is an actual gain, in which every citizen, of course, realizes his full share. Louisiana was purchased by the government of the United States for fifteen millions, and Florida for five, making together a total of twenty millions, which represents, at 5 per cent. interest, an annual rent of one million of dollars. To this extent the acquisition of these territories imposed a positive burthen upon the people of the United States. But if the territories thus acquired yield, even in their present imperfect state of cultivation, an annual revenue of twenty, thirty, or perhaps fifty millions, it is apparent that the general result of the transaction is a great national gain. If the present revenue of the people of the United States be fifty millions greater than it was before, there will remain, after deducting the annual loss of one million, a positive annual profit of forty-nine millions. The case of the establishment of manufactures in an agricultural country where they did not exist before, is precisely parallel. If the cultivator, in consequence of purchasing his plough in the place of his own residence, pay two dollars more for it than he would be obliged to pay if he sent for it to a distant city, he no doubt sustains, in the first instance, a loss of this sum. Let it be supposed that the difference in the prices is twenty per cent., and that the whole annual loss thus sustained by the village is twenty thousand dollars: On this supposition, the inhabitants pay to manufacturers residing among them a hundred thousand dollars for articles which, if sent for to a distance, would have cost them only eighty thousand. So far, there is, doubtless, an apparent loss. But it is equally apparent that, for the same reason, the revenue of the village is a hundred thousand dollars greater than it otherwise would be. Deducting the loss of twenty thousand dollars, there remains a positive gain of eighty thousand dollars. There cannot be, as is justly said, a plainer matter of fact, than that each inhabitant, under these circumstances, pays more for his manufactured goods; but though not plainer, it is equally plain, that his house, land, and all other fixed capital are proportionately more valuable, the returns of his labor greater, that he is, in a word, proportionably more wealthy, and that he enjoys in other respects the advantage of being a member of a more populous, wealthy, and important community. The correctness of the principle here stated, as applied to villages and towns, is

a matter of common observation, too familiar to all to require any proof. It is equally true in its application to the larger communities of independent nations. If, according to the estimate already alluded to, manufactures have been recently established in the United States which furnish annual products to the value of about 150,000,000 dollars, and if "there has not been, on the whole, any consequent diminution of the amount of capital previously invested in agriculture, commerce or domestic exports," it follows that the revenue of the country is greater by 150 millions than it was before. If, in order to effect the establishment of these manufactures, we have paid an average duty of 20 per cent. on the whole amount of manufactures, foreign and domestic, consumed in the country, estimated as above at 200 millions, there has been an actual loss of forty millions. Deducting this from the actual gain of 150 millions, there remains an ultimate profit of 110 millions as the final result of the whole transaction.

In employing here, and elsewhere, the numbers and estimates furnished by the opponents of the protecting policy, which are all of the most unfavorable kind, your memorialists would not be understood to acquiesce in their correctness. Their object is to avoid even the suspicion of exaggeration, and the possibility of any objection to their reasoning, founded on the inaccuracy, real or supposed, of their estimates. The opponents of the protecting policy will not, of course, take exception to such as are furnished by themselves. Although it is impossible to calculate exactly the whole extent of our manufactures, it is presumed that the above estimate of 150,000,000 is much too small, and that of 20 per cent., as an average duty paid upon the whole consumption of foreign and domestic manufactures, much too large. It is admitted that the price of coarse cottons, by far the most important branch of our domestic manufactures, is not affected by the protecting policy.

It is evident, therefore, that even where prices are permanently higher in consequence of the use of domestic instead of foreign goods, there is not of necessity any national loss; but that, on the contrary, the community may be at the same time realising a most important accession of wealth from the establishment of home manufactures. But if, in addition to the circumstances included in the above supposition, we also suppose, what is actually the case, that the amount of the difference between the prices of the foreign and domestic article is paid not to the home manufacturer, but to the government; that it goes to pay the public expenses, which must be defrayed by a contribution levied in the form of imposts upon foreign imported goods more cheaply, easily, and comfortably, than in any other way; and that the product of the protecting duties is not greater than the sum actually wanted for the necessary expenses of government, there will, under these circumstances, be no actual loss to set off against the positive gain, and the whole capital and labor employed in the new establishments, will constitute a clear addition to the wealth and resources of the country. It should be remembered, however, that the duty actually paid on the imported foreign article, is the only one that goes into the hands of the government, and that the increase in the price of home manufactures which is occasioned by the protecting policy, is, as far as it is real, under all circumstances, an actual loss to the country, to be set off against the positive gain resulting from the same cause.

The correctness of these principles is established by the universal opinion of the world, and especially by the splendid example of England. The

period is not yet very remote when the capital and population of Great Britain were employed almost exclusively in agriculture and commerce. Within a century, manufactures have been introduced into that country, and have flourished to an almost unprecedented extent. What has been the consequence? Will any one venture to assert, that the population and capital invested in these manufactures have been withdrawn from agriculture and commerce? Has the rental of England been diminishing during this eventful period? Is the amount of tonnage employed in the foreign or the coasting trade less than it was a century ago? Is it not notorious, that the amount of capital employed in agriculture has, within that time, been augmented to an almost incredible degree?—that it is precisely within that time that the commerce of England has assumed its present unexampled developement, and spread itself over every quarter of the habitable globe? Is it not equally notorious, that the establishment of manufactures, far from having obstructed the progress of other branches of industry, has been the precise immediate cause of their astonishing success? Has it not been a matter of common remark, since the close of the late wars, that it was not the artillery of Wellington and Blucher, nor even the noble enthusiasm of the youth of Germany, but the mightier machinery of the power-loom and spinning jenny, the splendid miracles of Arkwright and Cartwright, that sustained the cause of the alliance in all the fields of Europe for twenty-five years in succession, and finally overthrew the greatest military empire that ever existed? These results have been obtained under the auspices and influence of legislative protection. When the popular British economists, and those who adopt their opinions in this country, tell us that all this has been accomplished, not by the aid of protection, but in spite of it; that the spectacle of this national wealth and greatness, admirable as it is, is nothing to what it would have been, had private industry been left entirely to itself; they reason on a mere hypothesis, in the face of the most overwhelming and astounding evidence, proclaimed in a voice of thunder, by a millien of undeniable and irresistible facts. But, for the purpose of the present argument, it is wholly immaterial whether this hypothesis be correct or not. If the British manufactures would have thriven as well or better without the protection which has been extended to them by the government, than they have done with it, it follows that the protecting policy, as exemplified in England, has been either indifferent or positively injurious. But however this may be, it is admitted by all that the developement of manufacturing industry has been the great immediate cause of the extraordinary prosperity of England, and it is also generally admitted that, in this country, manufactures could not exist without the aid of legislative protection. If, therefore, we wish to enjoy the benefits that have been obtained by other countries from their establishment, it is necessary, whatever may have been the case with England, that we, at least, should steadily persevere in the line of policy which has been pursued in regard to this subject since the organization of the government.

We are told, in reference to the experience of other countries, that "a single glance at the map of Europe will satisfy every intelligent observer, that the superiority of some over other countries, in other respects equally fitted for manufactures, is due to the nature of the government, to laws which, at least, secure to men the proceeds of their industry, to liberty, or at least comparative liberty, and to the diffusion of knowledge and superior

intelligence, skill and activity, the infallible offspring of *unrestrained industry*, and of political, civil and religious liberty." In other words, correct legislation is the main cause, direct or indirect, of superiority in manufactures, and generally speaking, in all the departments of national wealth. Your memorialists are not called upon to reconcile this remark with another elsewhere made, on the same authority, and quoted above, which represents the idea of creating capital by legislative acts, as wholly chimerical. They will, therefore merely say, that to include *unrestrained industry*, by which phrase appears to be meant the absence of any legislative protection of domestic industry, among the prominent features of correct legislation on this subject, is simply to assume the point in question. They cannot conceive how this point can be made out to the satisfaction of an intelligent observer by a single glance at the map of Europe, when the first object that naturally attracts an American eye on that map, is a country which has enjoyed an extraordinary degree of prosperity under the influence of a protecting policy; and when Holland, next to England, perhaps, under an economical point of view, the most remarkable country in Europe, and which is declared to be "almost the only country which has adopted the opposite principle," has been regularly sinking in wealth and political importance in the same proportion in which England has risen. Your memorialists would not be understood to suppose that the protecting policy has been the only cause of the success of England, or the want of it the only cause of the decline of the Netherlands. They are aware, that, in these as in most other cases, the fortunes of nations have been determined by a variety of concurrent circumstances. It is sufficient for their purpose to remark that the two most prominent examples in the history of modern Europe, economically viewed, afford a direct contradiction—the one in a positive and the other in a negative way—of the principle which that history has been appealed to to prove.

Your memorialists will not fatigue your honorable body by enlarging any further upon a point which, were it not so often disputed, might be thought too clear even to require illustration. They feel themselves at liberty to assume, as a settled principle in political economy, that the introduction of new branches of industry, and particularly the establishment of manufactures, occasions, in general, an actual addition to the capital and population of a country, directly proportioned to the new demand for labor thereby created; and that, even where the price of the domestic product is permanently higher, a community may, notwithstanding, realize in this way, a great accession of wealth. In addition to this direct pecuniary profit, there are other advantages of a different character resulting from the same cause, to which your memorialists will now, more briefly, invite your attention.

The *second* great advantage, resulting from the establishment of manufactures, is the superior steadiness of the home market. All speculations, founded on the supposed situation of distant markets, are, in their nature, doubtful; and, when they occupy capital and labor to any great extent, introduce a continual and disastrous fluctuation into commerce, and, indirectly, into the whole industry of the community. The home market, on the other hand, is in general fixed and certain. Its extent may be calculated, and the probable increase or diminution of demand foretold with sufficient exactness. Foreign commerce is a sort of game, in which fortune exercises as much influence at least, as prudence and skill. All calculations

connected with it are not only more or less uncertain at the time when they are made, but are continually defeated by occurrences that intervene before their results can be realized. The whole capital embarked in this pursuit, and with it the happiness of its owners and their families, lie at the mercy of political events, or, in other words, of the caprice and violence of foreign powers. We cast our bread upon the waters, but whether, in this case, it return to us again after many days, is a matter of mere chance. When we have covered the sea with our products, a wanton belligerent (and some war is continually going on in one quarter or another,) issues a decree, and sweeps the whole into his own coffers. The United States, during the short period of their history, have experienced but too severely the truth of this remark in the injuries of this kind which they have sustained, not merely from the great powers, such as England, France and Spain, but even from the secondary States of Denmark, Naples, Holland, and the republics of Spanish America. Under such circumstances, we remonstrate —negotiate—go to war, perhaps—possibly, after the lapse of twenty or thirty years, obtain some partial satisfaction. In the mean time, the unfortunate individuals who were the victims of this legalized piracy, have seen their prospects for life blasted, and gone down, with their wives and children, in sorrow to the grave. No association can stand the force of these fatal shocks. Insurance companies sink under them like private fortunes. The only effectual remedy is the one employed by England, of maintaining a public navy sufficiently strong to command the ocean, and defy attack from any quarter; but the burden which such an establishment imposes upon private industry, makes the remedy nearly as bad as the disease.

Independently of the violent attacks to which the capital employed in these distant exchanges is exposed, the mere circumstance of dealing with foreign markets at a great distance, creates a dangerous uncertainty in the whole business. In time of war, the most extensive colonial and European markets are thrown open to our flour and other provisions, and our cultivators extend their enterprise in all directions, perhaps for years in succession. Peace comes at length, and all these markets are at once hermetrically sealed. Flour falls from ten or fifteen dollars a barrel to three or four, and ruin stalks at large through the fair fields of the middle states. Again: a panic terror is felt in England on account of a supposed deficiency in the supply of cotton actually on hand, and the value of the article takes a sudden rise. Our speculating merchants, incapable of estimating the correctness of these apprehensions, go on buying for exportation at extravagant prices. Immense supplies arrive in Europe. In the mean time, the imagined deficiency is found to be of little or no importance. The market is overstocked, and the merchants ruined. Finally, we are forced ourselves into war—as happened in the year 1812, by the mere effect of the embarrassments resulting from the defenceless state of the capital employed in foreign trade—the usual supply of foreign manufactures is checked. Immediately, large amounts of capital, following the direction which they would naturally have taken in time of peace had it not been for the very peculiar circumstances in which the United States have been placed, and to which your memorialists have already briefly alluded, are invested in domestic establishments, for the purpose of making up the deficiency. Every thing goes on prosperously until the war comes to a close. Within a few months after, our markets are inundated with British goods, cheaper than we can make them of equal quality, and the manufacturers are, in their turn, in-

volved in one common ruin. It is in this way that the fluctuations incident to these distant and uncertain exchanges reach successively all the great branches of industry. The results which your memorialists have thus described, are not accidental, but the regular consequences of the state of things to which they are attributed, and must continue to recur, from time to time, wherever such a state of things exists. No foresight, prudence, or probity, furnishes the means of avoiding them; and so extensive have been the disasters which they have brought upon the United States since the close of the late war, that there are probably very few individuals in the country who have not felt them within the circle of their own immediate connexions. It is true, that where there is hazard, there is also occasionally gain as well as loss; but one result is hardly less pernicious than the other, though in a different way. Large and rapid fortunes, whether considered in their effect on the persons obtaining them, or on the community, are highly injurious to good morals and regular habits of industry. These, on the contrary, are promoted by a course of trade, which, when carried on with honesty and prudence, produces slow and moderate but certain profits; and such is that which naturally takes place in a community where the three principal branches of industry furnish each other with a reciprocal home market for the greater part of their respective products.

In pointing out the uncertainty and fluctuations which are naturally incident to foreign commerce, your memorialists would not be understood to intimate that this branch of industry is not to be pursued at all, but merely that it cannot, with advantage, be made the basis of all the business operations of the community. This is almost necessarily the case in countries of limited extent and dense population, which are thus condemned by the necessity of their position, to go through a continual course of ruinous revulsions. In more extensive countries, possessing within themselves the materials for a large internal trade, to which foreign commerce is in its nature subsidiary; the latter, instead of creating fluctuation and uncertainty, becomes itself a sort of regulator of the home market, and serves as a wholesome check upon the occasional fluctuations to which even the internal trade is exposed. Thus the trade with this country is habitually employed by the British manufacturers, (as far as our policy will permit them to use it,) to relieve the encumbered state of their own home market; and the indirect advantage which they obtain at home, by exporting to this country a part of their superfluous produce, enables them to sell it here, without eventual loss, at prices very often considerably below the actual cost, and much below the remunerating price of the labor employed upon them in either country. This particular result, while it lasts, is no doubt advantageous to us as well as to them; but it is not advantageous to us to be brought within the vortex of these tremendous revulsions, and to find the prices of the necessaries of life in our own markets rising and falling with the political revolutions of nations on the other side of the globe. By fixing our industry on the basis of agriculture, manufactures, and the home trade, and making foreign commerce a subsidiary branch, we convert it from a cause of disturbance into a useful regulator and ally of all the rest.

In the remarks which they have thus far made upon the advantages resulting from the establishment of domestic manufactures, your memorialists have supposed, throughout, that the quantity consumed in the country is the same, whether they are imported from abroad, or made at home. But this is very far from being the case; and a *third* beneficial result of their

establishment is a greatly increased consumption of the necessaries and comforts of life, which is attended of course with a corresponding increase in the civilization and general welfare of the people.

The necessity of this result is easily seen. The exchange which naturally takes place between the two classes of agricultural and manufacturing laborers, is that of the means of subsistence for the products of art. The cultivator supplies the manufacturer with food and materials, and receives from him in return the articles of use, comfort, and luxury, into which these materials have been fashioned. But this exchange can never take place to any great extent, excepting when the two classes are situated in the neighborhood of each other, and belong to the same political society. Provisions are too bulky, and, in many cases, too perishable, to bear transportation from one quarter of the globe to another. If not consumed on the spot where they are raised, they cannot be consumed at all. Or, were it even possible to surmount this difficulty, it is, and always will be, and ought to be, the standing policy of other nations, to interdict their importation, excepting in extraordinary cases of actual necessity. We find accordingly that our provisions are excluded, in ordinary cases, from almost all the markets of Europe. They constitute, nevertheless, the staple product of at least two-thirds, according to some, of four-fifths, of our whole population. What then follows? Our cultivators, in most parts of the country, and in the usual state of commerce, have nothing to offer in exchange for foreign manufactures, and, of course, no means whatever of obtaining them. The manufacturing population of the old world is represented in every precinct of our territory by a few shopkeepers, and the amount of agricultural products consumed by their families, is the only reciprocal demand upon a county or township of our cultivators, created by their whole consumption of European manufactures, which, under these circumstances, must, of course, reduce itself to nothing. In particular sections of the union, the inconveniences resulting from this state of things are partially relieved by an extensive cultivation of the materials employed in the European manufactures, particularly cotton, and some other articles, such as rice and tobacco, to which our climate and soil are more favorable than those of Europe. Our exports of these pay for the foreign manufactures which we in fact consume. The transportation is effected by the navigation of the eastern and middle states, which, in this way, obtain a share of the returns. But the cultivators throughout the interior of these vast and populous regions, and throughout the whole western country, have nothing to offer in exchange for foreign manufactures, excepting the provisions of the ordinary kinds of which the caprice, or necessities of foreign powers, from time to time, permit the introduction into their markets. Their consumption of foreign manufactures must, under these circumstances, as your memorialists have already remarked, be extremely small; and if they have no domestic manufactures in their neighborhood, they are compelled to live without a knowledge of the arts, or an enjoyment of the comforts, of life. But it is the extent of this knowledge and enjoyment, that forms the distinction between the civilized and uncivilized states of society. A community thus destitute of home manufactures, and excluded from an intercourse with foreign markets, has a constant tendency to decline into rudeness and barbarism. This tendency has, in the particular case of the United States, been thus far counteracted by strong political and moral causes, but the only effectual and permanent remedy is to remove the principle of evil. It

was, therefore, with great reason that Mr. Jefferson, in one of his private letters written in 1816, declares his strong conviction of the expediency of bringing the producer into the neighborhood of the consumer. When, in any township, county, or section of country, there is a fair proportion between the number of families employed, respectively, in agriculture, manufactures, commerce and the liberal professions, there is, in consequence, a sure and steady market for the products of all; and all are supplied with the articles of comfort and luxury which are essential to civilization, and to the enjoyment of life. Prices must, of course, be paid, whatever they may be, and it is of little or no importance whether these are or are not the same on the other side of the globe. If a cultivator in the interior obtain from his neighbors in exchange for a part of his grain, good clothes and furniture, and a good education for his children, of what consequence is it to him whether he gives, for these comforts and blessings, more or less grain than they cost in Europe? He cannot send his grain to buy clothes and furniture, nor his children to be educated. His wants must be supplied by his neighbours, who will consume his provisions in exchange for what they give him, or not at all. If they be not supplied, he loses the sense of moral dignity that results from a civilized mode of life, ceases to produce any more grain than what is necessary to furnish him with bread and whiskey, sinks into idleness, and dies of intemperance; while his children, growing up without education, of course follow his example. Every article of use and comfort, which he can get at home in exchange for his surplus products, is, therefore, so much clear profit to him, although it should cost him twice as much as a similar article is worth in England, France, or China.

A *fourth* important advantage resulting from the establishment of domestic manufactures, is, that they render a people *independent* of all others in regard to the supplies of the necessaries and comforts of life. The intercourse between different countries is liable, from political causes, and particularly war, to frequent interruptions, which sometimes, endure for many years in succession. The effect of the return of peace, and of the renewal of intercourse after one of these interruptions, in prostrating the manufactures that have grown up during its continuance, has been already noticed; but it is also worth remark, that the first effects of such a suspension of intercourse, is to deprive a merely agricultural country of its ordinary supply of the necessaries and comforts of life, including the very arms and ammunition with which the war, that occasions it, is to be carried on. The impolicy of encountering this result, as far as the means of military defence are concerned, seems to be universally admitted. The most decided opponents of the protecting policy have recognized the expediency of providing, within our limits, and under the direction of the General Government, for the manufacture of the weapons and munitions of war. But it is quite obvious, that the very same principle goes the full length of justifying, or rather of imperiously dictating, the policy of protecting, by legislative aid, the manufacture of all the ordinary comforts and necessaries of life. It is no doubt important for the successful defence of the country against the attacks of a foreign enemy, that our troops should be furnished with arms and ammunition, but it is also absolutely necessary for this purpose, as well as for the comfort and well-being of the citizens at large, that the usual supplies of clothing, furniture, and other manufactured articles, should not be cut off, as, if received from abroad, they, of course, must be, on the occasion of a suspension of intercourse with the manufacturing country. The

force of this consideration is apparent, and especially in its application to the United States, in as much as the nation from which we receive most of our supplies of manufactures, is also the one with which we are most likely to be involved in political disputes. It is sometimes vaguely said, in answer to this suggestion, that the danger of non-intercourse, or war with the manufacturing nations of Europe, is imaginary; and that it is impolitic to legislate in anticipation of any such improbable contingencies. Unfortunately, however, there is too much reason to believe that the occasional occurrence of war, even among the most civilized nations, must be calculated on as inevitable. The most recent experience shows that, between such nations, and at this enlightened day, it is quite within the compass of possibility, not only that wars should occur, but that they should last, with little interruption, for five and twenty years in succession. During the short period of their independent existence, the United States have been involved in war, or in political relations which had the same effect on our foreign trade, for about fifteen years, or nearly a third part of the time. It has been calculated that, for the period of about two centuries, which has elapsed since the conclusion of the peace of Westphalia, and during which Europe claims to have exhibited a higher degree of civilization than was ever known in any other part of the world, every alternate year has been, on an average, a year of war. Is it then supposed that the United States, and the foreign governments with which they have intercourse, are to be forever exempt from the operation of the evil passions, and conflicting temporary interests, that drive the nations to these terrific extremities? Does theory or experience justify any such belief? Do the tone and character of our negotiations, since the close of the late war with Great Britain, render it probable that it is to be followed by a halcyon age of perpetual peace? Your memorialists fear that the necessary answer to these questions is far too obviously in the negative to admit the possibility of giving any other. Much as they deprecate the occurrence of future hostilities with any foreign power; anxiously as they desire that the good understanding which now so happily exists between the United States and most of the governments with which they maintain habitual relations, may be perpetual; sincerely as they have rejoiced at the recent conclusions of several arrangements which seem to authorize the expectation of an improvement in the future character of these relations, they must still regard it as the strict and bounden duty of an American statesman to consider the occurrence of war with any foreign power as a thing within the compass of ordinary probability, and to act upon the supposition. It is not our policy, nor yet the policy of foreign countries, but rather the naturally imperfect condition of human nature, which will occasian these hostilities whenever they may happen, and which renders the supposition of their possibility necessary. Should the international relations of the great powers of the Christian world be on no worse a footing for the next two centuries than they have been for the two last—and it would surely be rash, whatever we may wish and hope, to reason and act on the hypothesis that the next following age will be better than the best in the history of our race—we must still calculate, as your memorialists have already remarked, that on an average, every alternate year will be one of war. So far indeed are recent and present occurrences from warranting the expectation of any immediate change in this respect in the habits of the world, that, although the great Christian powers have been at peace among themselves since the conclusion of the treaty of Paris in 1815, there

has not been a moment during that time when the sword has been sheathed in all parts of Christendom, and hardly any two or three years in succession, when there has not been a strong probability of the occurrence of another general war, from which it would require the exercise of great discretion and ability in the government of the United States to keep them clear. At this moment, the danger of such an occurrence appears to be again very imminent; but whatever may be the issue of the present crisis, it is, at all events, clearly the duty of an American statesman to suppose, and to act upon the supposition, that the country is continually liable to be drawn into war with any of the foreign powers with which we have relations. If then we look to these foreign powers for our regular supply of the ordinary comforts of life, what is to become of us during these periods of occasional hostilities, which may last three years or thirty as the quarrel happens to turn? By what miracle are we to find, at a moment's warning, resources, before unemployed, which will furnish us with substitutes for this supply? Are we to extemporise at the commencement of every war, as we did at that of the last, a set of manufactures sufficient to meet the demand of twelve, fifteen, or, looking forward only to the end of the next five and twenty years, twenty million consumers, only to see them all shaken to their foundations by the return of peace, and sinking in one general ruin as they did before? Your memorialists can hardly imagine how any intelligent person can be so totally blind to the most obvious considerations of expediency as to counsel such a policy. They leave it with confidence to your honorable body to decide, whether it be not the duty of a prudent government to provide, by every imaginable means, against the recurrence of such widely spreading disasters; whether, were it even true, as it is not, that domestic manufactures would be, in the end, dearer than foreign ones, an annual pecuniary sacrifice of considerable extent made in this form, would not be decidedly preferable, both on the score of interest and feeling, to supporting the incalculable losses and miseries of every kind produced by these convulsions. For themselves, your memorialists have no hesitation in saying, that were there no other argument for the expediency of a protecting policy, except the single consideration to which they have last adverted, they should still regard it as established beyond the possibility of doubt.

The last advantage which your memorialists propose to mention, as resulting from the establishment of domestic manufactures, is their effect in restraining emigration from the settled to the unsettled parts of the country. It is true, as a general principle, that manufactures add to the wealth and population of a country, the whole amount of the capital and labor to which they give employment; but, in the particular case of the United States, where large tracts of good unoccupied land are continually for sale at low prices, it is probable, as your memorialists have already remarked, that some of the persons who, under the influence of the protecting policy, invest their capital and labor in manufactures, would, if this field of employment had not been opened to them at home, have emigrated to some of the unsettled parts of the country, and been occupied in clearing land. But when an individual can obtain a profitable market for his labor at his own door, in the midst of his friends and kindred, and of objects that are connected with the agreeable associations of his early years, he will hardly be tempted to go in search of it to a distant unexplored wilderness. The increase of population which thus takes place in the manufacturing states,

by creating an encreased demand for provisions and materials, renders it in turn more advantageous for the agricultural states to extend their industry at home, than to send off continually new colonies. In this way, the tide of emigration, without being wholly dammed up, is considerably checked throughout all the settled parts of the union, and the population of all begins to put on a more consolidated shape. This result, although it amounts in fact, as has been intimated, to a change in the direction of a part of the agricultural labor of the country, and a transfer of some of it to manufactures, not only furnishes no objection to the encouragement of this branch of industry, but is itself a strong argument in favor of such a policy. These remarks are not made under impressions in any way unfavorable to the character or interests of the younger members of the union. Your memorialists, in common with all their fellow-citizens, feel a just pride in the flourishing condition of the new states. They consider the rapid progress of these states in wealth, population, and general prosperity, as a spectacle unparalleled in moral magnificence by any thing to be met with in the annals of the world. Your memorialists are fully of opinion, that the sudden expansion of our population over the unsettled territories of the union, has been thus far productive of good. It has thrown open a broad and ample field for the national industry, and has brought into action a new political element, which serves as a sort of mediator between sectional interests, which might otherwise have proved to be irreconcilably hostile. But, admitting the reality of these great benefits, it is also certain that if, in a region like the interior of the United States, which cannot be supplied with manufactures from abroad, the whole population devote themselves exclusively to agriculture, and as fast as they increase, continue to spread themselves more and more widely over the unlimited regions that are accessible to them, they must live, in a considerable degree, without the knowledge or enjoyment of the arts of life, and be in continual danger of sinking to a lower degree of civilization. The singularly excellent character of the settlers, their industrious habits, and the high tone of patriotic sentiment which has always pervaded the whole population of the new states, have hitherto maintained them at a point of civilization which, considering their circumstances, is hardly less wonderful than the rapidity of their progress in wealth and greatness. But the only way in which the advances they have made can be secured, and a solid foundation laid for the fabric of social improvement, is by naturalizing, on the spot, the cultivation of the useful arts. As far as the protecting policy may have the effect of diverting, into this channel, a portion of the labor and capital of the country, which would otherwise be employed in clearing land on the borders of the union, it will work, undoubtedly, a material change for the better. It is almost superfluous to add, that no one section of the more anciently settled parts of the union is more particularly interested in this result than the others. It is well known that the emigration from the southern Atlantic states has been of late even more considerable than from any other quarter. In this respect, there is a complete identity of interest among all the different sections of the union.

It has been said, in reference to this particular branch of the subject, that "a comparison might be drawn with advantage between the respective situations, at the end of thirty years, of the working men who have availed

themselves of the natural advantages offered by the facility with which the rich unimproved lands of America may be acquired, and of those who have attached themselves to a manufacturing establishment." Your memorialists are inclined to doubt whether, on a fair comparison of all the circumstances of their respective conditions through life, that of an emigrant who goes off with his axe into the western wilderness, would be considered as decidedly preferable to that of the citizen who finds employment as a mechanical or manufacturing laborer in the settled parts of our country. They are well aware that industry, probity, and perseverance, will ensure success under almost any circumstances; but examples are certainly not wanting of mechanics who have acquired, in shorter periods of time than the one just mentioned, independent fortunes, and the most respectable stations in the society of our wealthiest and most populous cities. But it is not the intention of your memorialists to institute comparisons between different occupations, or to encourage any at the expense of the rest. They desire that every citizen should be left at liberty to select that pursuit which, in his opinion, will most conduce to his happiness; and it is for the precise purpose of affording to those citizens who may think it will contribute to their happiness to invest their capital in manufactures, an opportunity of so doing, which they could not have if they were exposed to a ruinous foreign competition, that your memorialists are anxious for the continuance of the system of protection.

Such are the advantages, economical, moral, and political, which, as your memorialists conceive, result from the establishment of domestic manufactures. If real, they certainly afford sufficient evidence of the expediency of maintaining the protecting policy. It is urged, however, in opposition to the conclusion which would naturally follow from these considerations on the one hand, that the protecting policy occasions a great *national loss*, by compelling the community to purchase their manufactures at higher prices than they would otherwise be obliged to pay; and, on the other hand, that this policy is unequal in its operation, and imposes a heavy burden upon the southern states, while it holds out a bounty to the industry of the north.

These two objections are founded, as your honorable body will perceive, in different, and in fact, directly opposite views of the principles that regulate the wealth of nations. The former supposes that a duty on imported foreign articles raises their price, and that of the corresponding domestic ones, in direct proportion to its amount, and that it is paid by the consumer, that is, the public at large. The difference between the prices thus raised, and those at which the articles would have been sold had there been no duty, is the measure of the supposed national loss; which is borne by all the citizens in proportion to their consumption. The other objection, which is chiefly sustained by citizens of the southern states, supposes that the duty, at least so far as the southern states are concerned, is not added to the price of the imported foreign article, but deducted from that received by the producer of the domestic one, which is exported in exchange for it. It is, of course, paid by the producer, and not by the consumer. There is, consequently, no rise in the price of the corresponding domestic article, and no national loss resulting from a difference of prices as on the former theory. The only loss sustained is the amount actually paid on the foreign imported article, and this is sustained exclusively or chiefly by the southern cultivators. It is estimated, in a recent document of high authority,

at the sum of about eight million dollars. These two objections are sustained with equal ability, zeal, and apparent conviction, by different parties among the opponents of the protecting policy. Expositions of both have been presented to your honourable body during your present session, evincing extraordinary talent and learning in their respective authors; but, as the theories supposed in them are, as your memorialists have remarked, directly contradictory to each other, it is apparent that both cannot be true.

Your memorialists submit to the consideration of your honorable body, whether this single circumstance be not sufficient of itself to induce you to pause, before you make the important changes which are demanded alike by these two parties in the long established economical policy of the country. Were the arguments in support of the protecting policy less satisfactory than they are considered to be by its friends, it would still be highly inexpedient, in the opinions of your memorialists, to adopt a different system, until those who recommend a change had come to some agreement among themselves in regard to the principles upon which the new system, so recommended, is supposed to rest, and the practical results that it is fitted to produce. It is often said, that the friends of protection, who are represented as the majority of the people of the United States, ought not to take advantage of their numerical strength, and that they ought to show some deference to the opinions and feelings of the minority, who may, after all, possibly be in the right. We are told, on authority, that "the problem to be solved in this country is, whether majorities, formed by combinations of sectional interests, will be governed by a sense of justice and a spirit of conciliation so as not to oppress those parts of the country whose *rights*, though they may be a minority, ought to be respected." It is obvious that the word *rights* is here inadvertently substituted for opinions: the *rights* being, of course, in this country, on the side of the majority. The friends of protection would, doubtless, concede a great deal with cheerfulness to the opinions of their fellow-citizens of the minority; but your memorialists conceive, that an appeal to considerations of this description would be entitled to more attention if the minority were themselves more closely united in opinion than they are. If, as is actually the case, there exist, among the citizens composing the minority, two opinions diametrically opposed to each other. it is evidently impossible for the majority, however well disposed for concession, to embrace the opinion of the minority. When the two sections into which the minority is divided, shall, by the exercise of a spirit of conciliation and compromise among themselves, and by a more mature consideration of the subject, have come to an understanding as to the principles upon which they recommend to the government a change of policy, it will then be more natural for them than it is now, to call upon the majority to concur with them in their principles, and to adopt the measures which they recommend. Considering, therefore, that the mere fact of the diversity of opinion among the opponents of the protecting policy, in regard to the reasons why that policy ought to be abandoned, is of itself a sufficient and decisive reason why the government cannot with safety abandon it, your memorialists consider it hardly necessary to attempt to refute, in detail, these objections, and the theories supposed in them. They will, however, from respect to the talents and character of the citizens who make these objections, add a few remarks upon each.

The first of these objections, as above stated, is, that the community

sustains, in consequence of the adoption of the protecting policy, a *national loss* equivalent to the difference between the prices of the manufactured articles, foreign and domestic, according as they are or are not affected by the duties. The theory supposed in this objection, which is, that the duty on the imported foreign article is added to its price, that the market price of the corresponding domestic article rises temporarily in proportion, and that the difference in the prices of both is paid by the consumer, your memorialists believe to be true. They have already had occasion to state that the amount of this difference cannot, with propriety, be regarded as a national loss, for the following reasons:

1. The rise in the prices of imported foreign goods, and of the corresponding ones of domestic manufacture, occasioned by the imposition of duties on the former, is merely temporary. The ultimate effect of the protection and consequent growth, progress, and flourishing condition of domestic manufactures, is to render these products cheaper than the corresponding foreign ones. It is admitted, that "when the supply of the domestic manufacture is, or may be made equal to the full demand of the country, domestic competition may reduce the rate of profits, and ultimately the cost of production." But a temporary sacrifice made for the purpose of obtaining a greater eventual advantage, instead of being a loss, is a source of real profit, and the habit of making such sacrifices, for such a purpose, is uniformly regarded, whether in the case of communities or individuals, as the strongest evidence which they can give of wisdom and discretion.

2. So far as the duty on the imported foreign article operates in raising the price of that article, there is not even a temporary sacrifice. It goes into the hands of the government, and is employed in defraying the public expenses. Now, these expenses must be paid by a contribution levied on the people in one form or another, and there is no way in which a contribution of a given amount can be levied upon the people so cheaply, so easily, and with so little injury to their feelings, as in the form of imposts. So long, therefore, as the sum levied in this way is not greater than the wants of the government, as determined by the dictates of a just and liberal policy, require,—and, in this country, the sum so levied is not, never has been, and never can be greater,—there is not only no loss, eventual or temporary, but an immediate as well as an ultimate gain resulting from the imposition of the duty. If it had not been imposed, the government would have been obliged to levy the same sum upon the people in a different way, and in addition to it, another sum sufficient to cover the additional charges of collection. It is proper to add, as your memorialists remarked in alluding before to these considerations, that so far as the duty on the imported foreign article operates to raise the price of the corresponding domestic one, the difference does not go into the hands of the government, and is, in fact, a temporary sacrifice.

It is not true, however, as is often intimated, that this sacrifice is made for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer. The returns of labor are regularly the same in all its departments. If in manufactures, or any other department of labor, they rise for a moment above the ordinary rate, they are immediately brought back to it, probably for a time below it, by competition. The protecting policy affords to the citizens the opportunity which they otherwise could not have, under the pressure of foreign competition, to invest their capital in manufactures. Having thus invested it, their profits are necessarily the same with those of all their fellow-citizens.

If the policy were abandoned, their loss would of course be much greater than that of any other class, because the property so invested would lose almost all its value. The temporary sacrifice imposed by the protecting duty, so far as it is real, is not therefore made by other classes of the community for the benefit of the manufacturer, but is made by the consumers, that is, by the whole community, manufacturers included, for their own benefit. The attempt to represent the manufacturers as a favored class, who are making large profits at the expense of their fellow-citizens, if not disingenuous, proceeds at least upon a wholly erroneous view of the subject.

3. But the great and decisive consideration which governs the whole of this subject is, that were prices even permanently higher in consequence of the adoption of the protecting policy, there would still be, not only no *national loss*, but a great and real national gain resulting from this policy. The nature and extent of this national gain have already been stated. Supposing the protection to be necessary, (and if it be not, it is of course nugatory and merely nominal,) it adds to the wealth and population of the country the whole amount of the capital and labor invested in the manufactures to which it gives existence. But the sacrifice occasioned by the adoption of this policy is merely a per centage, varying with the amount of the duty on this same capital. It is, therefore, were it even permanent, in the nature of a perpetual annuity paid as a consideration for a corresponding amount of additional wealth; and there is no more propriety in calling it a national loss than there would be in saying that a man who borrows money at five per cent. loses the interest. This is the most unfavorable view that can be taken of the operation of protecting duties, because, as has been already shown, the sacrifice they impose is merely temporary, and, even while it lasts, is, to a considerable extent at least, a real benefit instead of a burden; but even in this view of the subject, the community, by losing the interest, gains the principal. The nature of the transaction has already been illustrated by a reference to the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida, at the cost of a permanent annuity of a million dollars. In the same way, if we suppose the annual consumption of manufactures amounts to 200 millions, 50 foreign and 150 domestic, and that foreign manufactures are subject to an average protecting duty of 20 per cent., which permanently raises in the same proportion the price of the whole mass, the annual loss would amount to 40 millions, and the annual profits to 110. This, as your memorialists have remarked, is the most unfavorable view that can be taken of the operation of protecting duties; and when it is considered that this sacrifice is only temporary, that while it lasts it pays in the most convenient manner the expenses of the government, which must be paid in one way or another, and that the profit is constantly increasing with the progress and extension of manufactures, it is easy to see that the general result, instead of being a *national loss*, is a great, permanent, and constantly increasing *national gain*.

But admitting even, and it seems to be nearly admitted by a large and respectable portion of the opponents of the protecting policy, that the community, as such, suffers no loss in consequence of the measure, it is contended—and this is the second of the two objections alluded to above—that the sacrifice imposed operates unequally upon the different sections of the union; that it favors the industry of the north, while it loads that of the south with heavy and intolerable burdens. It is said on authority,

that "the existing restrictions, which are known by the denomination of the protecting system, operate injuriously upon the great and leading pursuits which employ three-fourths of the capital and labor of a region of country more extensive than any civilized empire in Europe; while, on the other hand, they operate beneficially on the great and leading pursuits of another region not less extensive." And, again: "The protecting duties are specific and ruinous taxes on the activity of the south, and sustaining bounties on that of the north." The system is accordingly represented as producing very opposite effects in these different quarters of the country. "The fairest portion of this great confederacy, if not the fairest, and of heaven the most favored region of the whole earth, is literally undergoing a silent but irresistible process of decay and desolation." And, again: "With a very small share of the natural advantages possessed by the planting states, the manufacturing states are every where covered with monuments and evidences of a thriving and prosperous industry which has scarcely any parallel, while the former are equally covered with melancholy memorials of thriftless toil, impoverishment, and ruin." With such views of the operation of the system, it is not unnatural that those sections of the country which think themselves aggrieved by it should express their feelings with a great deal of warmth and bitterness. We are told, accordingly, on the authority just quoted, that "the history of the world may be confidently challenged for a parallel instance of outrageous injustice, perpetrated under the forms of perverted legislation; that "the southern states are reduced to the very worst condition of colonial bondage to the tariff states;" that, "regarding the protecting duties in the light of fines and forfeitures for violating this new code of colonial restriction, we have only to see the revenue derived from this source squandered in improvements and other forms of expenditure in the favored region, to have a perfect picture of Rome and Italy flourishing in bloated prosperity on the plunder of the subject provinces." "Upon the whole," we are told, in conclusion, "the protecting system is utterly ruinous to the planting states, injurious to the western states, and exclusively beneficial to the manufacturing states, and ought to be abandoned with all convenient and practicable despatch, upon every principle of sound policy."

If your memorialists could imagine, for a moment, that the inequality here supposed in the operation of the protecting policy was, in the slightest degree, real, they would heartily join in the strong terms of condemnation which are applied to it, and would, without hesitation, acquiesce in the conclusion that it ought to be immediately abandoned. The constitution expressly declares, that "all duties, imposts, and excises, shall be uniform throughout the United States," and the spirit of this provision would be unjustly evaded if the required uniformity were not substantial, as well as nominal. Nor would the extent of the grievance sustained, in consequence of an infringement or evasion of this provision, be measured by the amount of the pecuniary loss incurred in consequence. The oppressive exaction by the government of a single dollar, would be as intolerable an evil to any citizen of this favored country, who duly appreciates his rights and privileges, as that of a million. It was not the amount of the pecuniary loss occasioned by the ship-money and the tea tax, but the illegal and consequently unjust and oppressive character of these duties, which roused our fathers in England and here to forcible resistance. It has been well remarked by one of the boldest European advocates of reform and liberty,

that the most successful revolution in civil government would be dearly purchased by the blood of a single individual. Your memorialists are, in like manner, satisfied that the advantages of the protecting policy, were they even much greater than they have been represented above, should be abandoned at once and without a moment's hesitation, if it were necessary, in order to realize them, to impose upon any individual or section of the union any burden, however trifling, which did not operate with perfect equality in substance and form upon all the rest. Equality is the peculiar characteristic, pride and boast, of this community, and any member of it who would consent to purchase any personal advantage to himself by a violation of the principle of equality in the person of any other member, in the smallest particular, would be unworthy of the glorious title of a citizen of the United States. Your memorialists are therefore fully agreed with those who make the objection now alluded to, in regard to the propriety and expediency of imposing no duties which do not operate with perfect uniformity and equality upon all parts of the Union; but they believe, that such is really the operation of the duties imposed on foreign imported articles for the protection of domestic industry.

It is, in fact, very generally admitted, as well by the writers on political economy as by the mass of well informed practical men, that all duties, however imposed, ultimately fall equally upon the whole labor and capital of the community; or, in a shorter and more familiar phrase, are paid by the consumer. The individual who buys an article for consumption, can only obtain it by giving in exchange for it another article of the same value, which, of course, pays for all the labor employed, in whatever way, upon the former. This principle does not seem to be disputed as a general proposition, even by those who complain most loudly of the inequality of the tariff, but they appear to consider their case as an exception to the rule. In ordinary cases, they tell us the person whose particular product is subjected to a duty, may exempt himself from the burden and throw it upon the consumer, by diminishing the quantity; that he produces, so as to furnish the market with such an amount only as he can sell at the increased price, and investing a part of his capital in other employments. But the cotton planter, from the peculiar character of his pursuits, has it not in his power to invest his capital in any other way, and must go on producing to the same extent as he did before the duty was imposed. "Nothing can be more extravagant," it is said, "than to suppose that the people of an immense extent of country, embracing eight sovereign states, can transfer a thousand millions of capital from agriculture to manufactures with the same facility that a hatter or a shoemaker can avoid a tax upon hats or shoes, by taking up some other trade." The quantity of cotton exported, and the demand abroad remaining the same, the quantity of manufactured goods imported must also be the same; and, as the demand for them at home is also unaltered, they must sell at the former price, which, of course, throws the burden of the duty on the planter.

Such is the argument of those who maintain that the protecting policy operates as a burden upon the southern agricultural states. The answer to it is sufficiently obvious: the cotton planter, or his representative, the merchant, who wishes to throw upon the consumer the burden of the protecting duty on a particular class of foreign articles, is not obliged to diminish the amount of his production of cotton, but only to import in exchange for it a smaller quantity of this class of articles, and a larger one of some other.

The quantity of cotton exported, and the demand abroad remaining the same, the effect of the protecting policy is simply to encourage that of some other foreign articles, which do not enter into competition with the products of our own industry. It has, and can have, no effect whatever on the price of cotton. It is not by importing specie, as is sometimes intimated, that the cotton planter avoids the payment of the protecting duty; such an attempt would be wholly ineffectual, for reasons too obvious to be mentioned here. He effects the object with perfect ease, by importing other articles, not subject to the protecting duty, and such is, of course, the method pursued. If he found that he could no longer exchange his own produce advantageously for British hardware, broadcloth, and other manufactures, he would dispose of it at Liverpool for specie and bills of exchange, proceed with these to France, Spain or China, and return home with a cargo of wines, silks, teas and spices, which would of course be sold at the same price, and with the same profit as before. The duty on them, whatever it might be, would be paid, as before, by the consumer.

The case of the southern agricultural planter is not, therefore, as is stated, an exception to the general rule, that all duties fall on consumption and not on production. The cotton planter pays no part of the protecting, or on any other duties, excepting what he pays in his capacity of consumer. It is true, no doubt, as it is said, that the exports and imports of every community are necessarily of equal value, and that a duty of a given amount forms an equal deduction from the wealth of the community, whether it be levied upon the former or the latter; but it is not therefore true that the individual who produces a third or a fourth part of the exported articles, necessarily pays a third or a fourth part of the duties on the imported ones that are received in exchange. The producer of the exported agricultural staple retains, in his own hands, that part of the imported manufacture which he wants for his own consumption, and on this he pays the duty; the rest he distributes according to their wants, among the other members of the community, who, in like manner, pay the duty upon them, and give him in exchange such other articles of foreign or domestic production as suits his convenience. If he pay a larger proportion of the protecting duties than others, it can only be because he consumes a larger proportional share of the foreign articles on which they are laid, and therefore it is admitted that there is no inequality. "So far as the protecting duties operate merely as taxes on consumption, there can be no great inequality in the burdens they impose upon the different portions of the union; and whatever inequality there may be, as it is founded on a larger consumption, it may be fairly presumed to be accompanied by a corresponding ability to consume."

In thus replying to the theory in which this objection of the unequal operation of the protecting duties is founded, your memorialists conceive that they reply to the objection itself, since the statements of it which have been made on the most respectable authority, are mostly of a general character, and very scantily sustained by precise and ascertained facts. We are told, in glowing language, "that, in the planting states, the blessing of heaven has been blighted by the consuming curse of federal legislation;" and that "the business of raising agricultural staples *must* be gradually and progressively abandoned in the south, and that of making manufactures in the favored mode substituted in its place under all disadvantages, if the protecting system be not utterly abandoned." It is no doubt true, that if the operation

of the protecting duties on the planting states were as unfavorable as it has been represented to be, the business of raising agricultural staples not only *must be*, but *would have been*, for many years past, gradually and progressively abandoned. The cause would have produced its natural effects in past years with as much certainty as it will in future. What, then, has been the fact?

In the year 1816, the whole crop of cotton was estimated at	68,000,000 lbs.
It has now risen to - - - - - - -	375,925,302
For the five years preceding the war, the exports of cotton averaged about - - - - - - -	57,000,000
In 1819, they had risen to - - - - -	87,397,645
And, in 1831, to about - - - - -	300,000,000

The period included between the years 1816 and 1831, coincides precisely with that of the protecting policy, and a comparison of the respective products of the two years certainly exhibits very little appearance of a "gradual and progressive abandonment" of the cultivation of the great staple of the south. It is known, in fact, that during this period the cultivation of cotton has been constantly extending itself from South Carolina and Georgia, which were formerly its principal seats, northerly into North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia; and southerly and westerly into Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana and Florida. While the statistical tables exhibit evidence of a constant and rapid increase in the total product, it can hardly be credited that "a revolution" has commenced, of which "no human power can arrest the progress, until a total change is produced in the pursuits and institutions of these states, involving a loss of at least half their capital;" although it may be true, as is said, that owing to the superior fertility of more southerly soils, the cultivation of cotton may have been relinquished in some of the more northern parts of the planting states. At all events, if "a gradual and progressive abandonment" of the cultivation of the great agricultural staples be the appropriate effect of the protecting policy, supposing its operation to be unequal, the progressive and rapid increase which has taken place in the cultivation of these staples, from the time of the adoption of the protecting policy up to the present day, proves very clearly that this supposition is incorrect, and that this policy, if not the cause of this increase, is at least compatible with its existence.

It is said, indeed, that the price of the agricultural staples, and particularly cotton, is much lower than it was formerly, and the decline is attributed, in part, at least, to the influence of the protecting duties. "The exchangeable value of cotton is diminished," we are told, "by this cause about two cents in the pound; and this loss the planter would sustain as a producer merely, even if he consumed no protected manufactures, or similar foreign manufactures whatever." Your memorialists have already shown that the cultivator sustains, as such, no part of the burden of the protecting duties; the contrary conclusion is founded on the supposition that the existence of these duties would lead to an increased importation of specie, which, as your memorialists have remarked, is entirely incorrect. It is true, no doubt, that cotton has very considerably declined in price since the adoption of the protecting policy; in the ten years preceding 1816, it was rather below 15 cents, it is now on an average 8. During the same period, the prices of many other articles have declined nearly as much; and it is not improbable that some causes, of a general character, such as the return of peace, improvements in machinery, or a change in the state of the

currency, may have contributed to produce this effect. But it would be quite superfluous to seek very far for the immediate cause of the fall in the price of cotton, when the prodigious extension that has taken place in the cultivation and production of the article, is amply sufficient to account for a much greater one. A sudden and rapid increase in the supply of any article, as compared with the demand generally, occasions a proportionate fall in the price; if the supply be doubled, the price falls to one half; if quadrupled, to a quarter. Now, the supply of cotton in the market, since the adoption of the protecting policy, has been more than quintupled; so that the price, in the natural course of things, should have fallen from 15 cents to 3, instead of 8. It has been kept up in this, as it is in all other similar cases, by the increase in the demand, which follows the increased supply, and consequent decline in price. It is accordingly stated, on authority entitled to the respect of the opponents of the protecting policy, that "the reduction in the price of cotton is solely due to the increased supply compared with the demand." In fact, the continual extension which has been taking place in the cultivation of cotton up to the present time, affords demonstrative proof that the price, however diminished, is still high as compared with that of other articles, and affords more than the ordinary rate of profit. If this were not the case, the cultivation, if not abandoned, would at least not have been extended. The moral laws of nature are as steady in their operation as the physical; and a constant and uniform extension in a particular branch of industry, for a long period, proves that the rate of profit in that branch is higher than the ordinary one, with as much certainty as the expansion of the mercury in the thermometer proves that the temperature of the air is warmer than it had been. We find accordingly from statements, resting on the most unexceptionable authority, that the returns on capital invested in the cotton plantations, are higher than the average returns in other pursuits.

It is further urged, however, by those who believe in the unequal operation of the protecting policy, that, by substituting domestic for foreign manufactures, it diminishes the foreign demand for our agricultural staples, and of course depreciates their value. "There is scarcely any limit," it is said, "to the demand for our cotton in Europe, if we will freely take manufactures in exchange for it." Let us suppose that the repeal of the protecting duties would create an increased annual importation of foreign manufactures to the amount of ten millions of dollars, of which four millions would be of cotton manufactures; for the whole of this increased importation cotton would be received, creating an increased foreign demand for more than 300,000 bales, but the domestic demand for cotton would be diminished only by the substitution of the four millions of imported for the same amount of domestic manufactures; and as the raw material required for that quantity of manufactures would not, at the utmost, amount to more than one million of dollars, it follows that the domestic demand for raw cotton would be diminished about 33,000 bales only, and consequently the increased aggregate demand for cotton abroad and at home would be 267,000 bales.

The theory here supposed in regard to the operation of the protecting policy is directly contradictory to that which represents the producer as paying the duty. If the producer pay the duty, the price of imported articles, the quantity consumed, and the foreign demand for agricultural produce, remain as before; if, on the contrary, as is here supposed, the

price of the foreign article is raised, and the quantity imported, and the foreign demand for cotton diminished, it follows of necessity, that the consumer, and not the producer, pays the duty. But without commenting on this inconsistency, your memorialists cannot but remark, that in the above passage, the real state of the case is singularly and almost ingeniously reversed. The foreign demand for cotton is obviously regulated by the general demand for foreign cotton manufactures; and, as the cost of the material is a comparatively unimportant item in that of the fabric, the manufacturer will purchase his cotton wherever he can find it of the proper quality, paying for it in such other articles as may best suit the market. Now the general market for foreign cotton manufactures is in no way affected by the protecting policy of this country, excepting so far as it may exclude a portion of those manufactures from our market by substituting the corresponding domestic ones in their stead. The extent to which domestic manufactures are thus substituted for foreign ones, is estimated in the above extract at four millions of dollars, and the quantity of material employed in producing the amount of manufactures of this value, at 33,000 bales. This, on the estimate here assumed, is the exact measure of extent to which the cultivation of cotton is unfavorably affected by the protecting policy; on the other hand, the same policy has already created a home market, the annual extent of which is estimated at

214,382

Deducting from this amount the diminution of the foreign demand as above - - - - - 33,000

There remains an amount of bales - - - - 181,382

Which measures the benefit already accruing to the cotton planters from the existence of protecting duties. The benefit accruing to the country from the same cause, is still more considerable. The amount just stated as the annual home consumption of cotton is about one-fifth of the whole product, which is estimated for the present year at 1,038,847 bales, averaging 361,86 lbs. each, or, as above stated, about 376,000,000 lbs. If it be supposed that the averaged value of cotton manufactures is four times as great as that of the materials employed in them, which is probably a fair calculation, it will follow that the community already derives from the manufacture of cotton a revenue fully equal to that which is derived from its cultivation. The value of the cotton manufacture is in fact estimated for the present year at $32,036,760, while that of the whole crop of cotton, at 8 cents per pound, would amount to about thirty millions.

But these results, however satisfactory, furnish a very inadequate idea of the extent to which the country will be ultimately benefitted by the establishment of this single branch of industry. The domestic manufacture of cotton, though now well established, and probably out of the reach of any unfavorable accident, is far from having attained its full development, and is, on the contrary, regularly extending itself with a rapidity which has been described as "without a parallel in history." The annual consumption of cotton for domestic manufactures, previous to the year 1816, is estimated to have been about eleven million pounds. It is now calculated at seventy-seven millions, and has, of course, increased six hundred per cent. in sixteen years; precisely the sixteen years during which the protecting policy has been in operation. During the same period of sixteen years, the annual consumption in the British manufactures, the pros-

perous condition of which has been universally regarded as a sort of miracle, rose from 93,920,055 lbs. to 245.000,000, and consequently increased 160 per cent. while that of ours was increasing six hundred. During the last four years, notwithstanding the temporary depression of 1828 and 1829, the annual consumption in the United States, increased 100 per cent. The greatest increase that has ever taken place, during any four years in Great Britain, is 56 per cent. The annual consumption of cotton in the United States, is already equal to the average of that of Great Britain from 1805 to 1810, which was estimated at 76,601,978 lbs. It is said by competent judges, that, "in all probability, the increase of domestic manufactures will be greater in proportion during the next period of twenty-three years, than during the last; since there will be more skill and experience, a more dense population, and a greater proportional capital." If the increase in the cotton manufacture for the next sixteen years should be only equal to that of the last, the annual consumption at the end of that time will amount to nearly 1,500,000 bales, and will consequently be nearly one-third greater than that of Great Britain is now. The revenue accruing to the country from the cultivation of cotton for the home market only, will amount at that time on this calculation, should the present prices continue, to about forty millions, and the revenue accruing from the home manufacture of the same article, according to the proportion before assumed of five to one, to about two hundred millions. It is of no importance to the present argument whether these anticipations will or will not be fully realized; though your memorialists can see no reason why the progress of this branch of industry should not be as rapid for the next sixteen years as it has been for the last; during the first part of which it was still struggling in its infancy with foreign competition, and during which it has passed through one period of severe depression. But however this may be, it is certain that the annual domestic consumption of cotton, is already equal to one-fifth of the whole crop, and that the manufacture, and consequently the demand for the material, are increasing with unprecedented rapidity.

On a view of these facts, the substantial correctness of which will not be contested, your memorialists submit it to your honorable body to decide, whether the cotton planting states, instead of being, as is supposed by some, oppressed by the unequal operation of the protecting policy, are not more benefitted by it, than those of any other section of the country. Without losing any considerable portion of the foreign demand for their produce, they obtain, by the effect of the protecting policy, a domestic one, which already amounts to a fifth part of the whole crop, and is still increasing with a rapidity that defies calculation. Your memorialists are wholly unable to imagine on what plausible ground a market so rapidly growing, and already so extensive as this, can be represented as "decidedly the worst in the world." The evidence given in support of this strange assertion, is not much more intelligible than the assertion itself. "Conclusive proof of this," it is said, "is found in the fact that the cotton planting states continue to trade with foreign markets, notwithstanding the protecting duties, rather than to trade on terms of free intercourse with the manufacturing states." The best answer to this "conclusive proof," is to be found in the facts already stated, that the cotton planting states do trade with the manufacturing states to the annual amount of more than 200,000 bales, and that this branch of trade has in-

creased 600 per cent within the last sixteen years. The home market, instead of being, as it is here represented, "decidedly the worst," is considered by all writers on political economy without exception, including Adam Smith, the great authority with the opponents of the protecting policy, as decidedly better than any other of equal extent. The internal trade is less subject to fluctuation, affords more frequent returns, and gives of course, larger and steadier profits than the foreign. It is, in short, by general admission, the most advantageous of the two.

In fact, the advantages accruing to the cotton planting states from the adoption of the protecting policy, are so great, and are fast becoming so obvious, that if there be any uniformity in the operation of the ordinary motives of action on the human mind, the warmest and strongest supporters of that policy will be found, within a very few years, in the southern section of the country. The manufacturer obtains from this policy no other advantage than the power of investing his capital in this branch of industry. His profits cannot, in general, exceed the ordinary rate. As far as manufactures are concerned, the great benefit, as your memorialists have already remarked, accrues to the country and not to the manufacturer. The cotton planter, on the other hand, has already invested his capital, and any new occurrence, which creates an additional demand for his produce, without any proportional diminution of that already existing, has a direct tendency to sustain his profits above the ordinary rate, as they undoubtedly always have been and still are, in this country. Your memorialists think too highly of the intelligence and discernment of their fellow citizens of the South to believe that a majority of them can long fail to perceive these indisputable and obvious truths, or to draw the conclusion from them that the interest of the great agricultural, and, more particularly, the cotton planting states, is, if possible, still more deeply involved, in the maintenance of the protecting policy, than that of those which are, or may be, the immediate seats of home manufactures.

Your memorialists have thus endeavored to state, however imperfectly, some of the positive advantages accruing to the community from the protecting policy, considered as a necessary means for promoting the establishment of domestic manufactures, and have noticed the principal objections which have been raised against it by its opponents. Independently of these objections, they often allege as motives for abandoning the existing system, the great benefits that are supposed to result from a system of free and unrestricted trade. The protecting policy is represented as an "infraction of an essential part of the liberty of the citizen." "Every individual," it is said, "in every community, without exception, will purchase whatever he may want on the cheapest terms within his reach. The most enthusiastic restrictionist, the manufacturer most clamorous for special protection, will each, individually pursue the same course, and prefer any foreign commodity or material, to that of domestic origin, if the first is cheaper, and the law does not forbid him. All men have ever acted, and will continue, under any system, to act upon this principle. It is impossible that they should universally act in this manner, unless it were for their interest so to do. The tariff system is founded upon the principle, that what is true of all men individually, is untrue when applied to them collectively. We cannot consider the adhesion of enlightened nations to regulations of this description, but as the last relic of that system of general restrictions and monopolies which had its origin in barbarous times."

In this, as in many other similar statements, the opponents of the protecting policy have substituted bold and reckless assertions, couched in not very temperate or decorous language, for a cautious and correct enunciation of facts. So far is it from being true, that every individual in every community, without exception, will purchase whatever he may want on the cheapest terms within his reach, that a large proportion of the inhabitants of every civilized community, habitually purchase all the ordinary necessaries and comforts of life at two or three times the price at which they might easily obtain them. This is the case with all the citizens of Paris, London, Boston and New York, including the able author of the document from which the above passage is extracted, who is himself an exception to the rule which he declares to be without any exception at all. This distinguished gentleman, notwithstanding his decided preference for the cheap foreign article over the dear domestic one, habitually pays, in the *domestic* market of New York, two or three times as much for food, clothing, fuel, and other articles of ordinary consumption, as they would cost him in the *foreign* market of the interior of the country. Why? Because he finds it more convenient to purchase them, though at higher prices, at a place where he can turn his own labor to good account, than to buy them cheaper at a place where his own labor would be less profitable. This is precisely the principle which lies at the bottom of the protecting policy. Were it even the effect of this policy, which it certainly is not, to render prices permanently higher, the cultivators of the United States would still find it more advantageous to purchase their manufactures at the domestic market, where they can offer the products of their own labor in exchange for them, rather than to buy them at lower rates in foreign markets, from which a great part of our products are in one way or another excluded. And this principle, which is thus fortified by the example of one of the distinguished opponents of the system, is distinctly avowed in theory by another. "It is better for the farmer," says a writer of authority, "to give a higher money price for manufactures to the domestic establishment, which will take the productions of his farm in exchange, than to obtain them at a much lower rate from the foreign establishments, which will take scarcely any thing he has to give."

It is not true, therefore, that individuals regularly purchase where they can get the articles which they want at the cheapest rate. They purchase them in that market, whether foreign or domestic, which they find on the whole, most convenient for this purpose. In a more general phrase, each individual naturally gives to his labor that direction which, under all circumstances, will enable him to turn it to the best account; and of this he is, of course, from his more intimate knowledge of these circumstances, a better judge than any individual or body politic can be for him. But it does not follow from this that the community can never with advantage exercise an action as such upon their own economical concerns. The individual will judge more correctly of what will promote his interest, under the circumstances in which he is placed, than the community, as such, to regulate these circumstances, as far as may be, in the manner most conducive to the general good—a function which is entirely beyond the sphere of action of the individual, but which, in its results, may very materially promote his interest. An inhabitant of one of our Atlantic states, who, before the adoption of the protecting policy, was prevented, by the fear of foreign competition, from investing his capital in manufactures, may

have employed it in carrying coffee from Batavia to Antwerp, or in clearing wild lands on the banks of the Missouri; and, in so doing, may have given it the direction which was at that time, under all the circumstances, the most judicious. But it does not thence follow that it was the best which he could possibly have given it had he been at liberty to choose, or that it is not his policy and duty, as a member or the community, to concur in so regulating the circumstances under which he acts, as that he shall be able to employ his capital at the place of his residence rather than in the opposite side of the globe. In time of war, the merchants of all countries apply to the government for convoy, and, as far as may be practicable, regularly receive it. They would probably be much disappointed if they were told that they were the best judges whether a voyage like the one contemplated was the best employment in which they could invest their capital; that, if it were, they would naturally take it, and that any interference of the government would only disarrange the regular course of events in a way which could not, on the whole, be conducive to the general good, or their own. The pretence which is often put forward that the economical concerns of the community are to be considered as entirely exempt from the action of the government, is, in fact, so far from having any foundation in truth, that these economical concerns are precisely the subject which, in all civilized countries, occupies the attention of the government, almost to the exclusion of any others. Of the two great departments of legislation and jurisprudence—the civil and criminal—the former, which, if not more important, is more extensive and complicated, and far more frequently applied in practice than the other, is employed entirely about the economical concerns of individuals. Property itself is the creation of society, and could have no existence in that imaginary condition of individual independence which itself never existed, excepting in the dreams of poets and philosophers, and which has been absurdly called the state of nature. The regulation of matters relating to property, its tenure and transfer, the modes of employing and turning it to account, constitutes, as has just been remarked, the great subject of practical legislation. If the individual can manage his own concerns so much better than any body else can manage them for him; if he can al-always give to his labor and capital the direction which is, on the whole, the most advantageous; if, like the French merchants in the time of Louis 14th, he has nothing to ask of the government but to let him alone, how happens it that he cannot venture to sell an acre of land or a bale of cotton without calling on the government to aid him in the transfer; that he cannot take his neighbor's written promise to pay him a sum of money till it has been endorsed by the government; or venture to accept a a piece of money that does not wear upon its face the public stamp, that warrants its purity? The doctrine that the action of government is not to extend to the economical concerns of individuals, is one of the developments of the anti-social spirit that prevailed in Europe half a century ago, and ended by throwing some of its fairest regions into wild confusion. The work of Adam Smith on the Wealth of Nations, in which this doctrine was first promulgated, was written in part under the influence of this spirit. It is pervaded throughout by a strain of bitter and contemptuous mockery of the great religious and political truths which have always, in all countries, commanded the habitual veneration of wise and good men. The object of the philosophy which it teaches is to loosen the bands

of the social union, and bring men back to the imaginary state of individual independence alluded to above, and which, in this theory, is regarded as a state of ideal perfection. Society is supposed to be an evil, and, admitting it to be, to a certain extent, a necessary one, the less it affects the condition and conduct of the individual, the better. Its adherents seem to forget that men are, by nature, social as well as individual beings; that, far from finding their happiness in a state of individual independence, they derive it entirely from their social relations; that, instead of attempting to weaken these relations, and keep men away from each other, it is the part of true wisdom to bring them together, and to strengthen, by every practicable means, the bonds that naturally unite them. The anti-social spirit, to which your memorialists have alluded, was a not unnatural re-action of public opinion against the great abuses which deformed the religious and political systems of the old world. As far as it tended to correct these systems, and substitute sounder and purer ones in their stead, which, to a certain extent has been the case, it operated well. But in this country, no such abuses exist, or ever have existed. Our political institutions are the plain and simple expressions of our social condition: our rulers are our own fathers, friends and neighbors, elected by ourselves to represent and act for us in some of our most important concerns. We have no more reason to be unduly jealous of their action on these subjects than on those of a private character, in which we habitually give them all our confidence. In this country, the sphere of individual action has been extended, and that of government restricted, to a greater extent than ever was attempted before. Our great danger is certainly from the abuse, not of power, but of liberty; and it should be the endeavor of the real friends of the country by a liberal construction of the law and constitution, and a generous confidence in the motives of those who administer them, to facilitate the business of administration, and diffuse a spirit of harmony and union throughout the whole constitution of the state.

It is true, as your memorialists have remarked, that every individual naturally gives to his labor the employment best fitted on the whole to promote his own interest, and that, consequently, manufactures will naturally spring up of themselves in all countries which are naturally fitted to be their seats, and where no extraneous causes interfere to prevent their growth. This principle is, in itself, certain, but has no application to the practical business of government. It is also certain, that water naturally seeks its level, and, when not obstructed by some extraneous cause, is sure to find it. But what would be thought of a shipmaster, who, on the strength of this principle, should affirm that the sea was, in fact, always smooth, and, under this persuasion, should persist in carrying sail in all weathers? It is obvious that his want of discretion would be very soon punished by the loss of his vessel. The case is similar with the abstract truth of the natural equilibrium of trade and industry. Every branch of industry would naturally spring up on the soil best adapted to it, and might be safely left to take its course, if there were no extraneous causes to operate upon it. But when was there, or will there ever be, a moment in the history of the civilized world, when the whole mass of private industry was not under the influence of a thousand causes modifying its condition in as many different and contrary ways? Communities are constantly acting on each other in the forms of negotiations and alliances, wars, and rumors of wars, voluntary associations, and actual conquests. The history of the

world is, in fact, made up of a series of political and civil revolutions, the decline and fall of some nations, the establishment and flourishing condition of others, the discovery of unexplored regions, the settlement of colonies, their subsequent admission as new nations into the great family; the promulgation, establishment and fortunes of the various religions; the successive struggles between the great elementary principles of LAW and LIBERTY, always active, never completely reconciled under any political institutions, and, from time to time, rushing madly into an open conflict that convulses the whole frame of society. These, and others of the same absorbing interest and widely spread influence, are the events that are constantly occurring in the vast theatre of the political world. Of these events, the least important affect, in a very considerable degree, the course of private industry. The Methuen treaty, for example, a quiet arrangement in two short articles concluded more than a century ago, without any appearance of political commotion between the governments of Great Britain and Portugal, is one of the causes which, at this moment, operate most effectually in determining the course of the trade in wine in these United States. Political events of greater consequence, such as the American and French revolutions, divert for a time the whole current of the commerce and industry of the Christian commonwealth, and often turn it permanently into new channels. In the midst of these never-ceasing convulsions, is it imaginable that any wise government can act for a moment upon the supposition that the course of industry can be left with safety to regulate itself? Is it not obvious that a community which leaves the course of industry to regulate itself, leaves it in fact to be regulated by the policy, the caprice, or the violence of other communities not having the same interests? Is it not plainly the duty of intelligent and patriotic magistrates to take such measures as may appear most suitable for protecting those with whose concerns they are entrusted, as far as may be, from the consequences of the adverse policy, or direct violence of other governments, by so regulating the circumstances under which they apply their industry, as to enable them to do it, as far as possible, to the greatest advantage. The smaller states, whose limited territory, population, and resources, prevent them from acquiring a substantial independence, must remain forever exposed to incessant shocks, until some one, more violent than the rest, closes the term of their political existence. Those, on the contrary, which, like the United States, possess in their vast territories, their extensive and rapidly increasing population, and the inexhaustible richness and variety of their natural resources, the means of maintaining a self subsisting and really independent position in the world; are bound to assume this position as speedily as possible, by encouraging the development of these resources in every practicable way. This is the great and leading purpose of the PROTECTING POLICY. It aims to render us a world within ourselves, deriving, from a friendly intercourse with foreign nations, all the advantages which we now do, but exempt from the continual shocks which our industry has heretofore sustained from a too close connection with that of Europe. Besides this purpose, it also has in view that of raising the standard of civilization, and increasing the comforts of the people, by diffusing, more universally among them, the enjoyment of the necessaries and comforts of life, by carrying them home, as it were, to the door of every citizen. Finally—and this, though the last and humblest, is not the least substantial of the benefits conferred by it—it reduces the

prices of all these articles by furnishing them without the heavy charge of a transportation from distant countries on the other side of the globe.

Your memorialists ought, perhaps, to apologise to your honorable body for dwelling so long upon general propositions, which may well be supposed to be familiar to all your members. But it is the peculiar character of this discussion, that the opponents of the protecting policy seem to rest their case, almost exclusively upon mere theoretical reasoning, without regarding the plain and palpable facts that contradict their conclusions. It is assumed by one party among them that the producer pays the duty, and they thence conclude that the cultivation of cotton is going to decay, at a time when it is regularly spreading at the rate of 600 per cent. in sixteen years. By another party it is contended that the consumer pays the duty, and that the public are burdened by an enormous increase of prices, at a time when it is notorious that every protected article has been regularly declining in price since the adoption of the protecting policy, and is now cheaper than it ever was before. These, and the other gratifying facts of the same description, which meet our observation at every step of the inquiry, furnish, no doubt, the most satisfactory answer that can possibly be given to the theories alluded to: but when they are offered as motives for a new and untried course of legislation, it is also necessary that they should be met in the way of argument. Your memorialists have accordingly endeavored to state, in the concise form which belongs to this exposition, the manner in which the establishment of domestic manufactures operates on the political, moral, and economical condition of a community. If there be any correctness in the view which has been taken of the subject, it will appear that their influence, in all these respects, is of the most beneficial character: and that an abandoment of that policy to which they owe their existence, would amount to a sacrifice of one of the principles that contribute most actively to the promotion of our present remarkable national prosperity. Without enlarging any further on this subject, your memorialists will conclude by inquiring very briefly, whether there be any circumstances in the present crisis of our political or financial affairs which renders it proper to adopt a new system that might not otherwise be considered eligible on general grounds?

The approaching extinction of the public debt is generally regarded as an event which should naturally lead to a reduction of the revenue; and, as this is principally derived from the duties on foreign imported articles, a reduction can only be effected by the repeal of a part of these duties. In the propriety of such reduction, your memorialists entirely agree; but they conceive that it is in this, as in all other cases, the effect should be co-extensive with the cause. If the motive for the reduction of the revenue be the extinction of the debt, the urgency of the case will be fully met by a reduction equivalent in amount to the sum which has been annually appropriated to this purpose, and which is ten million dollars. Nor is it perhaps necessary, that the reduction, in order to correspond substantially with this change, should go at once to the full amount of this sum. It is the natural tendency of protecting duties, as far as they accomplish their object of substituting the domestic manufacture for the foreign one, to become every year less and less productive. Hence, if the revenue should in future be collected chiefly in the form of duties on protected articles, it would gradually diminish of itself; and were it even left at present two or three millions higher than the necessary expenditure,

would, in a very few years, fall to the level of this, and probably below it. In the meantime, employment might easily be found for this temporary surplus, in a way most conducive to the public good, by investing it in some of those great works of internal improvement which are loudly called for in various parts of the country, and which would contribute so efficaciously to the consolidation of the Union, and the promotion of the prosperity of the citizens. Your memorialists have not, therefore, thought it necessary to inquire what will be the amount of the annual receipts and expenditures of the government in future years. It is sufficient for the present purpose, that the reduction required by the extinction of the debt, may be met by a repeal of the duties, the product of which approaches within a reasonable degree to the sum of ten millions. Such a repeal may be effected without any material infringement on the principle of protection, as appears from the following statement of the amount of the duties on certain articles for the year ending September 30, 1830.

		Value.		Duties.	
Silks from India, less debenture		$1,000,000	duty 36 per cent,	$360,000	
other places	do.	4,000,000	" 22 "	880,000	
Watches, and parts of	do.	310 000	" 12½ "	38,750	
Pearls and precious stones	do.	65 000	" 12½ "	8.125	Add 10 per
Tin in plates	do.	361,000	" 15 "	54,150	cent on du-
Opium	do.	37,000	" 15 "	5,550	ties $10,807
Raw silk	do.	10,000	" 15 "	1,500	
				$1,348,075	

	Gallons.	Duty.		
Wines, less re-exported,	166,000	50 cts.	197,250	
sherry do.	48,500	50		
red, France and Spain,	1,110,000	10	111.000	
Do. not enumerated,	1,180,000	15	177,000	
Sicily, and other countries not enumerated,	800,000	30	90.000	
				495,250
	Pounds.	Duty.		
Teas, bohea, less debenture,	149.000	12 cts.	17,880	
souchong	1.676,000	25	419,000	
hyson skin & other green	1.685,000	28	471.800	
hyson and young hyson	3,150.000	40	1,256,000	
imperial	280,000	50	140,000	
				2,304,680
	Pounds.	Duty.		
Coffee, less debenture,	38,500,000	5 cts.	1,925,000	
Cocoa	1.000,000	2	20,000	
Almonds, currants, prunes & figs	3.160,000	3	94,800	
Raisins in jars,	3,260 000	4	130,400	
other	2,700,000	3	81,000	
				2,251,200
	Value.	Duty.		
Spices, ginger, less debenture,	2,000	2 cts.	40	
nutmegs do.	54,250	60	32,550	
cinnamon do.	4,000	25	1.000	
cloves do.	38,000	25	9,500	
black do.	1,100,000	8	88,000	
pimento do.	1,340,000	6	80,000	
cassia do.	100.000	6	6.000	
Books, not English, Latin or Greek	90,000 vols. at 4		3,600	
				221,090
Molasses, 8,370,000 gallons, paying 10 cts. per gallon, remit half, say 5 cents per gallon				418,700

Brass in plates	$10,608	duty 25 per cent.	2652		
Saltpetre, crude	32,214	12½	4027		
Camphor	107,000 lbs.	8	8560		
				15 239	
					6,635,534

N. B. In addition to the above, the duties might be remitted on worsted stuff goods, and on articles not enumerated paying 12½ and 15 per cent duty.

Worsted stuff goods imported in the year ending September, 1830	$1,400,000	duty 25 per cent.	$350,000	
Man. goods not enume'd	883,000	12½	110,460	
Do. do. do.	2,558,858	15	383,827	
			$844,287	
	Add 10 per cent.		84,428	
				928,715
				$7,993,756

It results, from this statement, that duties to the amount of about eight million dollars may be repealed without any material interference with the principle of protection. With a reduction to this amount, and with the progressive decline which the progress of our domestic manufactures will occasion in the product of the duties on the corresponding foreign ones, the treasury would soon be relieved of the embarrassment of a surplus-revenue. It has been objected to a measure of this description, that it repeals the duties on luxuries, which are chiefly consumed by the rich, while it maintains those on the necessaries and comforts of life, which are borne by the poor. We are told that, "if the duties on wines, silks, tea, and coffee, were repealed, or reduced below the common average, while those of from 50 to 100 per cent. on iron, salt, coal, sugar, and coarse clothing, were preserved, every substantial farmer or mechanic would pay more annually than men who have an income of $5000, and, with respect to the poorer classes, the tax levied on each individual would increase in proportion to his wants." The truth is, however, that a repeal of the duties on tea, coffee, and the cheaper wines, would probably be felt as a relief by a larger class of persons than that of any other duty whatever. The difference in the price of these articles, occasioned by the duty, is of no consequence to the wealthy, who can afford to consume them at whatever price they may be sold. But there are numbers of families, constituting the poorest class of those which consume any foreign articles at all, which can only afford to purchase them at limited prices. The repeal of the duty, and consequent reduction of price, would bring them within the reach of a great many families of this description, who could not otherwise enjoy them, and would be felt by them as a real addition to their comforts, while it would be of little or no importance to the rich. The substantial farmer or mechanic could then, without inconvenience, indulge himself and his family with some of those foreign luxuries which, merely as such, are often estimated beyond their real worth. That persons of this description would pay more in duties on protected articles than a man whose income is $5000 a year, is an evident error. The substantial farmer or mechanic consumes, in general, few, if any articles imported from abroad, and few, if any domestic products of which the price is enhanced by the effect of protecting duties. He consumes, almost exclusively, the common household fabrics, the value of

which is in no way affected by these duties, until the progress of domestic manufactures brings a better article, at a cheaper rate, to his own door. On the other hand, the consumption of a person whose income is $5000, is made up, almost wholly, either of imported articles subject to duty, or of domestic ones which, in consequence of the duties, are sold temporarily at enhanced prices. A reduction of the kind proposed, without being of any material advantage to the wealthy, would therefore have a double operation in favor of the middling and poorer classes. As far as it repealed the duties, it would bring within the reach of these classes a great many comforts which they could not otherwise enjoy, and, as far as it left them in force, it would tend, by encouraging the home manufacture, to supply them more abundantly, and at cheaper rates, with the common necessaries of life. It is probable, from the recent experience of England, that a repeal of the duty on tea would make a real addition to the comforts of the middling and poorer classes, which would be far more than equivalent to the inconvenience which they suffer from all the protecting duties put together.

Your memorialists remarked in the outset, that it was not their intention to examine in detail the several articles in the tariff. for the purpose of undertaking to determine whether the present rates of duty are or are not in every instance precisely what they should be. They have considered the question at issue to be, whether the protecting policy shall be sustained; and this must of course be decided by considerations of a general character, and which do not involve the inquiry into the amount of the duty which is or may be with propriety levied upon each particular article. Researches of this description, as far as they are wanted for legislative bodies, can only be supplied with advantage by committees, aided by the oral communications of practical men. Your memorialists will, however, venture to offer a few suggestions in regard to an objection which has been made to the duties on a whole class of articles, and which, if well founded, would be fatal to the protecting policy in some of its most important features. We are told that, "in trying to reconcile a majority of the people to the system, and for the purpose of obtaining still greater protection, the advocates of restriction have altogether departed from a principle the soundness of which is admitted by all, and by none more than by those who would sacrifice every other interest to that of certain favored manufactures. In the face of the example and experience of other nations so strenuously appealed to, they have attempted to promote manufactures by laying high and sometimes prohibitory duties on the raw materials—in one instance, on that of the very manufacture which was the principal object of their solicitude; in others, with a total disregard for the branches which depended on the taxed material."

Your memorialists are not aware that the principle that duties are never to be imposed on articles employed as the materials for manufactures, and which is here represented as *admitted by all*, has ever been recognized by any respectable authority. Were it even the object simply to encourage manufactures, without reference to any other interest, it might, and in many cases would be highly expedient to impose protecting duties on raw materials in order to encourage their production at home. It is of the highest importance to the success of manufactures, that the materials employed by them should be produced at the least possible distance from the place where they are wrought up: and it is, as your memorialists have already

remarked, one of the greatest natural advantages which this country possesses for the pursuit of this branch of industry, that it is well supplied with all the most necessary and useful materials. But the object of the friends of protection is not, as it is here gratuitously intimated, to build up any one branch of industry at the expense of the rest; but to foster and encourage, with equal favor, all the great interests. It is, in fact, just as important for all the purposes for which the protecting policy is desirable, that it should extend, as far as they require it, to cotton, wool, iron, hemp, and flax, as to the various manufactures into which these articles are respectively transferred. Whether we look to the national security and independence, to the reduction in the prices of the necessaries and comforts of life, or to the actual addition to the wealth of the country, for each and all of these purposes, the production of the material within our own territory is not less essential than that of the manufacture. If we have not at home a supply of materials and machinery, any interruption of our intercourse with the foreign nations from which we receive them would be fatal to our manufactures, and would place us in the same situation as if we imported the finished article. It seems to be admitted that it is absolutely essential that we should be able to supply ourselves at home with arms and munitions of war. How can this be effected unless we produce at home the materials which are employed in them? How can we furnish our troops with arms from our foundaries and armories without producing domestic iron, or clothe them without domestic wool? How can we build and rig our ships of war, independently of foreign supplies, without domestic iron and domestic hemp? The home production of all these articles is absolutely indispensable to the national defence, and is therefore entitled to encouragement, even on the system of the opponents of the protecting policy. Yet it is precisely to the duties on these articles that we find, in certain quarters, the strongest objections. That on iron is perhaps more frequently a subject of complaint than any other; but certainly, if any one article were to be selected which, in preference to all others, is a fit subject for protection, it would undoubtedly be this; entering as it does into the composition of all the principal implements of war, and of every description of mechanical machinery. It is a matter of just congratulation, that this most important branch of production is at present in a flourishing and rapidly progressive state. The domestic supply of iron is now valued at eleven million dollars, while the foreign is valued at less than four. In the mean time, the price, instead of increasing, has regularly diminished; having fallen, since 1816, more than fifty per cent. No rational account can be given of this decline of price, except by attributing it to the increase of skill, and the competition which naturally result from a more general pursuit of any branch of industry, and which could not have taken place in this, without the encouragement afforded by the protecting duty. The continued importation of a comparatively small quantity of iron, does not prove, as has been supposed, that prices, low as they are, would be still lower were it not for the duty, or even that the domestic product is not sufficient to supply the market. It only proves, what was very well known before, that in this, as in all other cases, the foreign producer retires gradually and reluctantly from a market which he has been accustomed to monopolize; that he is willing to persevere in his business for a certain period on mere speculation, and to sell at a positive loss in the hope that the circumstances which threaten to check it may prove to be temporary. The immense importations that took place in 1827 and 1828, and

which amounted to more than double the average quantity, seems to indicate something like a concerted action for the purpose of crushing our domestic production, and amply justify the increase of duty in the tariff of the latter year. While this operation is continued, it is obvious that the duty, instead of raising the price of the domestic article, is paid by the foreign producer. The production of wool and woollen manufactures is not less important, and equally prosperous with that of iron. The capital invested in this employment is estimated at not less than 167 millions. These great departments of production are now on the point of reaching that period in their progress which has already been attained in the production of cotton and cotton manufactures, and which places them beyond the danger of foreign competition. To arrest their advancement at this most critical moment on the vague and merely theoretical ground, that it is inexpedient to lay protecting duties on "raw materials," would be hardly consistent with just notions of policy, or with the practice of enlightened and judicious statesmen.

There are various other views of this great subject, some of them not less interesting than those which have been presented, but they involve a mass of details which would exceed the necessary limits of this exposition. In the brief outline of the argument which has now been offered, your memorialists have endeavored to state distinctly the advantages resulting to the country from the protecting policy, considered as a necessary means for the encouragement of domestic manufactures, and through these, of all the great branches of industry; to remove the principal objections which have been urged against it on general principles; and to show that there is nothing in the present financial situation of the government which renders it expedient to repeal duties to an extent which would interfere at all with the principle of protection. The motive for maintaining this principle, which have thus far been dwelt upon, are founded entirely in considerations of general policy, and have no reference to the particular situation of any class of the citizens. But your memorialists, considering themselves as more immediately representing the manufacturing interest, deem it their duty to submit to your honorable body, in conclusion, a single remark upon the position and claims of this numerous and respectable portion of the community.

The protecting policy is not a new and untried system. It is known historically, that one of the principal objects which were kept in view in the formation and adoption of the federal constitution, was to invest a General Government with power to secure our own mechanical industry against the ruinous inroads of foreign competition. The preamble of the first revenue law which was framed and enacted by the same great statesmen who formed the constitution, declared in express terms, as your memorialists have remarked before, the expediency of encouraging domestic manufactures. The distinguished financier, who took charge of the Treasury Department under the present constitution, and whose able and luminous report on manufactures has been ever since appealed to as authority by all parties, lent the sanction of his name and influence to the same policy. It has been pursued with undeviating perseverance, and apparently increasing conviction of its essential correctness, for a period of fifty years, under all the successive administrations of the General Government, however divided the individuals composing them may have been on other important political questions. For a long time past the citizens,

whatever might have been their individual opinions of its expediency, must necessarily have regarded it as the established policy of the country, and were therefore justified, as prudent and judicious men, in permitting it to influence them in regard to the manner of employing their labor and capital. Immense sums have accordingly been invested in manufactures, which could not have taken this direction without the encouragement afforded by the government. The precise amount of the capital so invested cannot be ascertained with certainty, but the annual product has been estimated, even by those who have an interest in depreciating it, at 150 million dollars.

Your memorialists will not say that, under these circumstances, they have a right to claim of the government, as an act of justice, the continuance of the protection which has been granted them for the last half century. They are aware that individual interests, however important, must always yield to the paramount object of the public good. But they may perhaps say, without impropriety, that the circumstances which would call for and authorise the abandonment of a system of administration so long established, and the destruction of the incalculable amount of property depending on its maintenance, must at least be of the most imperative description, that the principles upon which such a measure could be justified must be so clear and convincing, as to command the unanimous assent of all honest and intelligent men. And your memorialists respectfully submit to the consideration of your honorable body, that where there is no appearance in the actual situation of the country of any urgent necessity for a change; where the citizens who call for it, composing together an acknowledged minority, are also very much divided among themselves in opinion on the subject; this state of things, the only one which could possibly be supposed to justify so desperate a measure, does not exist.

In consideration of all which, and fully confiding in the intelligence, discretion, and patriotism of your honorable body, your memorialists beg leave respectfully to repeat their request, that the duties on foreign imported articles which enter into competition with the products of the industry of our own citizens, may not be repealed: and, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

By order of the committee appointed to prepare a memorial to Congress.

A. H. EVERETT, *Chairman.*

Boston, *March* 19, 1832.

MEMORIAL TO THE SENATE.

TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, THE UNDERSIGNED BEG LEAVE RESPECTFULLY TO REPRESENT:

That, among the proceedings of the "convention of the friends of domestic industry," held in the city of New-York, on the 26th October, 1831, was the appointment of a "permanent committee" to whom the interests of the various parties represented in the convention were generally referred, after its adjournment—and that this permanent committee, for more convenient action concerning the matters submitted to its charge, appointed the undersigned a "central," or acting committee, confiding to them the business of the convention, which had been referred as just above mentioned.

This statement is made out of respect to the senate, and in justification of the proceeding which the undersigned now feel it their duty to adopt—and they are encouraged in this measure, because of the courtesy of both houses of congress, shewn in the reception of a similar memorial, or supplementary statement, from the committee of the "free trade convention," which sat at Philadelphia in September last.

The undersigned would desire to avoid unnecessary encroachments upon the time of the senate, and hence the remarks which they have to offer concerning the tariff bill, recently passed by the house of representatives, shall rather have reference to certain general principles involved in that bill, than its particular items—believing that the interests more immediately affected will make their own special representations, and enter into such details, as their several cases may separately need. For, in building up any system, whether for the purpose of protecting the industry of the country, or securing an adequate amount of revenue, the members of the senate, in conformity to their own prudent and wise usages, will naturally seek the opinions of intelligent individuals, and make up their judgments upon just comparisons of the views of practical men.

The right and duty of governments to protect the industry of a people subject to their laws, being established by the practice of all nations, and fully recognized by numerous acts of the congress of the United States, from the earliest date under the existing constitution until this present time, the undersigned have only to offer a few liberal observations as to the extent, which, in their humble opinion, this policy of the American government and people should proceed, for the efficient support of great national interests.

Differences of opinion may exist among the best friends of the protective system as to the amount of duties which should be assessed on imported commodities, with a view of obtaining adequate supplies of like articles from domestic materials and labor, in due course of time, and at reasonable prices; thereby also creating a home market for various pro-

ductions of nature and art—of the forests, and fields, and workshops, which the foreign market rejects. The relation which one branch of industry bears to another, however, should always be carefully investigated—and every thing be called by its right name. For example—a duty levied on woollen cloth is, by some, esteemed an act for the particular benefit of the manufacturers of woollens; but is really an act to promote and protect the interests of the landholders and laborers in agriculture. In every hundred dollars worth of cloth, manufactured in the United States out of American wool, the latter have not less than seventy-five dollars, for materials and subsistence furnished by them. The present capital employed in the woollen business of the United States is estimated at $165,000,000—of this large amount $125,000,000 are believed to be invested in lands and sheep, to furnish subsistence and materials to the manufacturers, who employ 40,000,000 dollars of the first named aggregate capital—or less than one-third of that of the agriculturists, on this account: and it should be observed, that the foreign market will not receive the product of these lands, or of the labor employed in the cultivation of them. Hence, when we speak of protecting duties on cloth, we mean the protection of the landholders and agriculturists. The supplies of these to the woollen manufacturers of the United States, are supposed to have an annual value of about 25,000,000 dollars, in wool and other materials, and bread stuffs and meats, &c. and the question occurs, shall this great domestic demand be destroyed by an *inefficient* duty on woollens? And destroyed it must be, in such a contingency, by casting a numerous class of consumers into that of producers—and a diminished price of agricultural articles must necessarily ensue, as well because of diminished demand, as of increased production.

Like remarks might be applied to others of the great branches of the national industry—but the case presented, the undersigned believe, will cover them all—the principles set forth being of universal reference.

The gigantic power of England, derived from the excited industry of her population, is the wonder of the world. This industry enabled her, for a long time, to withstand "united Europe in arms." It is no argument against the principle of her protecting laws, that the mighty profits produced by them have been squandered or abused—or that individual sufferings have followed those accumulations of values which have rendered England the workshop, and warehouse, and banker of nations. As well might indiscreet exposures to the rays of the sun be preferred against its principles of light and heat. The power of England is the result of centuries of care—of inexhaustible vigilance and unbounded zeal—of a lofty national pride, and a just estimate of the domestic resources of the country; and the industry of the people being defended at every point, the amount of the products for home supply, or foreign exportation, being pushed to its utmost extent—and the value imported, except of indispensable raw materials, reduced to the smallest possible limit, by restrictions and prohibitions—the British nation became so rich as to be able to pay about 300 millions of dollars per annum, in taxes, into the public treasury, besides various rates and other exactions for public services having a general aggregate of nearly 100 millions more, at a time when the entire population of Great Britain was less than 13 millions of souls—or about the same as the present population of the United States. The undersigned would have no part in the imposition of such burthens on any people—

but the *ability* to bear them is stated to shew what a highly excited and carefully protected industry can accomplish. That like *profits* would be earned in the United States by a steady pursuit of those means which have secured them to Great Britain, we cannot doubt; but, under our system of government, instead of being swallowed up in public expenditures, they would be devoted to the comfort or enjoyment of private individuals, except in the small and comparatively unimportant amount required for the support of our republican institutions.

The general principles of the policy of England may be shewn by references to a few leading articles—say coal, bread stuffs, and wool and woollens. To each of these *classes* belong many important items.

1*st class the prohibited*—such as coal, beef, pork, &c. We shall only notice the first, and by way of example.

The duty on coal, if imported, is £2 or $9 60 per ton, though the average price at London is only 18*s.* per ton, including, we believe, certain port charges, or local duties. The capacity of England to supply herself with this indispensable article may be called unlimited, and an immense capital and vast amount of labor is variously employed in mining and transporting it—and it is, besides, a great nursery for seamen; and hence the possibility of foreign importations, to derange the home supply, is absolutely forbidden.

2*d. The occasionally prohibited.* The duties on bread stuffs are so arranged that they increase as price declines, and become prohibitions, (as they are at present),* when, because of abundant crops in England, the selling price of grain is so reduced that the product of foreign fields must be kept out to save English farmers from ruin—the *general* price of bread stuffs in other countries being much less than in England. The operation of these duties (so far as is practicable in the nature of things), is to insure *steadiness* of price in the English market for grain, and forbid foreign gluts at periods when they might prostrate English agriculture. The effect of scarcity and supply is well understood in England. A surplus equal to one-tenth of a whole quantity required by the demand, would diminish the money-value of that quantity in a greater sum than the entire cost of the surplus—and a general embarrassment in business inevitably follow. A superabundant harvest is not always thought beneficial to England—this cannot be guarded against; but, at all times when the supply is about equal to the fair demand, the home market is secured to the home producer, by a prohibitory duty. For any temporary advantage in behalf of consumers in a lessened price of bread stuffs, England will not inflict *ruin* on her great agricultural interests, or discourage cultivation by bankrupting those engaged in tilling the soil. Grain must be planted before its crops can be reaped. The farmer, deprived of the means of obtaining seed, is conditioned like the manufacturer, who, because of excessive importations, is compelled to stop his wheels and dismiss his working people. The "seed time and harvest" are lost—and the profits that ought to have been derived from land and labor unemployed, is the gain of foreigners. And here it may be observed, that, if in respect to grain and meat, and fuel to prepare them for food, the laws of England are prohibitory—what claim may be preferred, in her behalf as being friendly to "free trade?" It is well known to the gentlemen of the senate, that every important product of our

*The present duty on flour is nearly four dollars the barrel.

forests, fields and fisheries, cotton excepted, is absolutely prohibited an entry into England, or taxed with such enormous duties as forbid their general use. It is thus that the "balance of trade" is kept in favor of England, and all nations rendered more or less subject to the influence of her policy and power.

3*d. Articles for exportation.* These are of great variety and of immense value. Time is not allowed the undersigned to prepare, nor could it be expected that the senate would examine (in the present advanced period of their session), the detailed statements which might be offered as to this class of commodities. The policy of England, with respect to two or three items of this class, shall be briefly mentioned; but we think it may be said, and without a solitary exception, that *every* important English manufacture, now exported, has reached its present perfection, cheapness and abundance, through protection, and, in many cases, by prohibitions, by which the domestic industry was excited to go beyond the domestic demand. We are happy to say that such results have partially attended our own yet recent, and more feeble, system of policy.

We have before us "Pope's Customs" brought down to March 1820, and Boyd's British Tariff for 1828. These are standard works—and both, if not prepared "by authority," were so accepted in their day. The undersigned beg leave to shew some of the duties as they stood in 1820 and 1828, in further evidence of the policy of England.

Iron		1820.	1828.	*Present American duty.*
In bars,	ton*	£7 18 4	£1 10 0	$22 40
Slit, &c.		21 18 0	5 0 0	78 40
Hoop		23 15 0	23 15 0	78 40
Wrought, pr. ct. ad. val.		50 0 0	20 0 0	25 00
Wool and woollens				
Wool,	lb.	0 0 6	0 0 0¾†	82 2-3 p. ct.‡
Woollens, generally per cent. ad val.		50 0 0	15 0 0	55 per ct.‡
Cotton goods generally, pr. ct. ad val.		50 0 0	10 0 0	48 5-8 per. ct.‡
If printed, &c.		75 0 0	3½*d.* sq. yd.	same‡

It may be well to observe, that the English duties on iron and on woollen and cotton cloths, until after 1820, (probably until July 1826), were much higher than those imposed by the present laws of the United States. Reduced to dollars, at 480 cents the £ sterling, they stand thus:

	English duties	*American duties.*
Iron in bars,	ton $37 00	$22 40
Slit, &c.	103 20	78 40
Hoops	114 00	
Wrought, generally, per ct. ad val.	50 00	25 00
Woollens, generally, "	50 00	55 00
Cottons "	50 00	48 62
If printed, &c. "	75 00	

*The duties were a little less, if imported in British ships.

†If costing more than 1s. 2*d.*, if less ½*d.*

‡These are the general averages ad valorem, as shewn in the statements submitted by the secretary of the treasury, on the 7th May last.

And it should be added, that the British ad valorem duties are assessed on the estimated value of the goods *in* England. It would not appear from this statement, that, if it was good policy in England, for a long period of years, and until after 1820, to protect her leading manufactures in the manner stated, it should be esteemed a bad policy in the United States to keep up and preserve the small comparative amount of protection, for a few late years extended, to *establish* such leading manufactures in this country—for we think it will not be pretended that we are more unfitted for making and manufacturing iron, wool and cotton than England was.

The very great changes that happened in England as to the duties imposed on iron and woollen and cotton goods imported, originated in various causes: in part, by improved processes in manufactures, and increased labor and capital applicable to them—*but chiefly, to maintain her monopolies.*

The people of several nations had begun seriously to inquire why the profits on their labor so much centered in England—why she commanded the money-market of the world—why she advanced or depressed the rates of exchange at her will; and they made the discovery, that, while England enjoyed a comparatively free trade with them, they were only permitted to have a closely restricted trade with her,—and a system of retaliation, or of *self-defence*, was commenced—the United States and France taking the lead in it.

The British statesmen then earnestly investigated the condition of their manufactures—practical men, in every branch of business, were summoned, to give evidence before committees of parliament, &c. and all the facts that belonged to the seemingly most trifling, as well as the most important departments of industry, were ascertained with astonishing patience, and every thing was carefully noted, in which the skill, labor and capital of England "*feared no competition*"—and on all these, the duties were materially reduced; those on the raw materials used in them, (unless the home supply was nearly or amply sufficient), being also much diminished. Then it was that Mr. Huskisson, and other British statesmen, first began to talk about "free trade"—saying to those of other nations, we have reduced our duties, why should you increase yours? But every member of the senate will recollect that it was openly avowed by Mr. Huskisson, and others in parliament, that such reductions were proposed or made *only with respect to those articles in which competition was not feared;* yet two mistakes were made, which have caused an extraordinary degree of private suffering and a great national loss, on account of labor thrown out of employment. We allude to silks and gloves. These were prohibited until July 1826. On the first was placed a duty of 30 per cent. on their value in England; and on men's and women's gloves an average duty of 6 shillings per dozen pair; and these duties, though seemingly very high, have been found inadequate to the protection of silk manufactures and the manufacture of gloves. But the general design of these great alterations in the British tariff may be illustrated by a few cases: the duty on plain cotton goods was reduced from fifty per cent. to ten—but that on printed cotton goods fixed at 3½*d.* or 7 cents per square yard. The export of wool had been prohibited, to retain the whole domestic production; and, with a reduction of the duty on foreign wools, the British farmers, (growing large quantities of certain descriptions of wool), were allowed an open market for it. But according to the old Spanish proverb, "the cloak was not large enough to cover itself," and the principle of the project stood revealed. And when the Bri-

tish minister suggested to the French minister a reduction of certain duties, *pari passu*, M. de St. Criq, the director of the customs, sagaciously and sarcastically replied, "the system adopted by England is admirable, *because it endangers none of her manufactures.* And we, when we are as forward as England, will be as liberal. But until then, *we must stand fast by our prohibitory system.*

This remark of M. de St. Criq is so conclusive, that it does not seem worth while to pursue the subject any further, and we shall only just remind the senate, that the products of our forests, (in timber), and those of our fisheries, are prohibited—that British "caught" oil pays a duty of one shilling per ton, and foreign oil £26 12*s.*; that the present duty on flour is equal to about 80 per cent. on its cost in the United States—that rice pays 15*s.* the cwt. and tobacco 3*s.* per lb.—that we have no important surplus product which England receives, even at a duty of from 50 to 75 per cent. except cotton, unless some gold from the recently discovered mines in the south. Gold is the most convenient, as well as the almost universal medium of exchanges; and England well knows that, in commanding the supply of this metal, she commands, or in some way controls, the action of a large part of the civilized world.

The undersigned would respectfully state, that the preceding facts and remarks are humbly offered in support of their opinions, as to the general policy which ought to be pursued at the present interesting crisis of our national affairs; being placed in an extraordinary position, because of a probable revenue much exceeding the ordinary wants of the government.

It is generally admitted, that a reduction of the revenue should promptly be made—though we, not regarding the present "taxes" as onerous, believe that their whole surplus product might be beneficially returned to and distributed among the people; but yielding our opinion to that which seems the more general will, we desire that the revenue may be reduced in such manner as to preserve, in all its efficiency, the present moderate system of protection, entire. In some cases, perhaps, diminished duties may not *destroy* our manufacturing establishments, and certain reductions might be submitted to in a spirit of conciliation, to those of our opponents who seem rather to seek the minimum degree of protection at which the establishments can *exist*, than that liberal support which, rendering them *permanent*, would have a natural and certain tendency to reduce cost to consumers, through a highly excited domestic competition----often severe, but the only one that a nation should permit, having a due respect for its own prosperity in peace and security in war, unless enjoying a *perfect reciprocity* in its trade with other nations:—a state of society which we regard impracticable; a theory that must remain Utopian, until it shall please the Great Creator of all things to give the same soil and climate, wants and wishes, governments and customs, to all the human race.

But without such a reciprocity we regard it morally impossible that the people of any country can have prosperity in peace, or security in war, unless defending its own industry. We have but little wherewith to settle our exchanges with Europe except as stated above; and the alternative is presented of manufacturing articles for ourselves, or doing without them. The command of Pharoah, that the Israelites should "make bricks without straw," was not more oppressive on that people, than a liberal introduction of foreign goods into our ports would be upon a large majority of the peo-

ple of the United States—for it must result in the necessity of *purchasing* such goods to the uttermost extent of our means, because of the sure and swift destruction of our own establishments. What can we do with those who will not receive bread and meat in exchange for cotton and woollen cloths? It appears to the undersigned, that we should consume our own bread and meat, and manufacture cotton and woollen cloths for ourselves. When by this system we shall have arrived at that fulness of strength which England has obtained by centuries of vigilance,—the United States, like England, will be prepared to make partial retirements from the protecting policy; but not "until then," as M. de St. Criq, with so much sagacity and patriotism observed.

We shall now, very respectfully, present to the senate a few suggestions concerning wool and woollens—a compound interest which seems more directly attacked in the bill from the house of representatives, and which we fear will be prostrated by that bill, if approved by the senate.

The secretary of the treasury, in his late comparative statement, says, that the average duty on wool imported in 1830 was at the rate of 82 2-3 per cent. ad valorem, and yet we imported 5,622,960 lbs. in the year ending September 1831. It is certain then,—if desirable that the growth of wool in the United States shall advance to the extent of the domestic demand, that its product must be protected, as it was protected in England, until a few years ago. And it will occur to the senate, that the much higher price of the flesh of sheep in Europe than in the United States, must have a powerful and irresistible influence to enable agriculturists in the former to break down the competition in the latter, as to the supply of wool—as the latter might break down, or embarrass, the agriculturists of the former, in the supply of wheat and other grain—a liberal intercourse existing between the parties in both cases. We regarded it as important to the farmers of the United States that they should be protected in the growth of wool, as it is esteemed by our rival that English farmers should be protected in the growth of grain; and therefore beseech the senate to render the duty on wool *efficient*—in a firm belief, that protection and security in the home market will lessen cost to consumers, in a reasonable period of time.

But the undersigned are fully assured that any duty on foreign wool, to protect the home production of the article, will be rendered altogether null and void by defect in the laws for protecting the manufacture of woollens —because no one believes that, in the present state of things, the United States can become exporters of wool, as they will be, when a more dense population shall render sheep more valuable for their flesh than their fleece. "Until then" the protection of wool growers and wool manufacturers must go hand-in-hand. It is possible that the latter might be protected and the former abandoned—but it is not possible to protect the wool grower without defending the manufacturers of wool. "We hold these truths to be self evident."

In assessing the rightful amount of duties on wool and woollens, it appears to the undersigned that the important fact should be steadily kept in view—that the raw wool constitutes about one half the general value of the cloth made out of any given quantity: hence a fifty per cent. ad valorem duty on wool, and on woollens, affords the latter a practical protection of

only 25 per cent. the same rules being applied to the material and its manufacture. Thus:

100 dollars worth of cloth imported, subject to a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem, will pay	$50 00
There is in this cloth 50 dollars worth of wool, also subject to a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem, or	25 00
	$25 00

And the law which gives to the wool grower a protection of 50 per cent. affords the manufacturer one of 25 per cent.

As before stated, the undersigned do not wish to waste the time of the senate by entering into details, which have, probably, been better furnished by practical men than they could hope to supply them; and, in conclusion, would earnestly solicit the senate that the various items in relation to the materials and manufactures of wool, cotton, iron, hemp, flax, &c. and, especially, if *changing* the present rates of duties on them, or on articles the product of the mechanical trades, chemical preparations, &c. may be carefully examined, and the facts be ascertained, whether, even at the present rates of duties, those branches of business are capable of successful competition with the cheaper labor of Europe. For we take it as granted, that the senate of the United States possesses no disposition to reduce the laboring people of this republic to the condition of those of the crowded communities of the old world.

Importations of 1830 *and* 1831 *(left for consumption) the exports being deducted.*

	1830.	1831.	*Excess.*
Wool	$92,172	$1,287,540	$1,195,368
Manufactures of wool	5,574,389	12,789,375	7,214,986
cotton	5,912,862	12,861,366	7,948,504
Iron and its manuf's.	5,288,934	6,496,163	1,206,229
			17,565,087

Value of our domestic exports in 1830	59,462,029
do do do 1831	61,277,057
Value of imports left for consumption in 1830	56,462,029
do do do 1831	83,157,598
Excess in 1831	26,668,157

With these facts submitted, the undersigned would only add their confident hope, that the senate will weigh every item of the bill recently passed by the house of representatives, and, in the apparent or real necessity of reducing the public revenue, preserve the system of protection, and ensure the prosperity of the people of the United States.

H. NILES,
THOMAS ELLICOTT,
HUGH W. EVANS,
JOHN P. KENNEDY,
J. W. McCULLOH

Central committee, N. Y. convention.

Baltimore July 4, 1832

BRITISH AND AMERICAN TARIFFS.

From Niles' Weekly Register of August 4, 1832.

We now present a comparative view of the British tariffs of 1820 and 1828, and of the American tariffs of 1828 and 1832, with respect to many leading and important articles—as an appendix to the memorial of the permanent committee of the New York Convention to the senate of the United States, inserted in the last REGISTER. In getting-up these heavy statements, a few errors, perhaps, may have been committed, notwithstanding all our care to avoid them. In cases where specific duties, under the American tariffs, are rated as duties ad valorem, for more easy comparison—the latter are taken from the treasury statement of May last.

We have not time to go into particulars—but request a careful *examination* of these tables, to ascertain how the British have nursed *all* the products of their fields and workshops and mines—and that, though in 1826 they reduced the duties on certain commodities, *not a single article was touched in which a foreign competition was feared*, unless still abundantly protected. And it will also appear, that even the modified "*free trade*" British tariff of 1828, taken altogether, is much higher than our "abominable" anti-free trade tariff of the same year! And, with such facts before us—was it *honest* to propose the destruction of many branches of industry in the United States, (and in some cases to effect it), AND ABANDON OUR CLAIMS TO A JUST RECIPROCITY IN OUR DEALINGS WITH GREAT BRITAIN?

BRITISH DUTIES ON GRAIN AND FLOUR, &c.

The details relative to the duties payable on wheat, barley, oats and other grain, and flour and meal, imported—are very intricate and tedious. It may, however, be sufficient to observe—that measures are adopted to ascertain, at frequent stated periods, the *average of prices* of grain in England, and on these averages the amount of duty payable is assessed. Until lately, unless the average price of British wheat was 10 shillings a bushel, (240 cents) foreign wheat was not allowed for the domestic consumption. But after the 1st July 1827, a scale of duties was enacted, from which the following extracts are made:

WHEAT.		FLOUR.
Average price per quarter of 8 *bushels.*	*Duty.*	*Barrel of* 196 *lbs. duty.*
72*s*.	1*s*. 0*d*.	14 cents.
70*s*.	4 8.	61
65*s*.	14 8.	1 96
60*s*.	24 8.	3 30
55*s*.	34 8.	4 65
50*s*.	44 8.	5 98

There is a special duty for every shilling, lessening as the price rises, from 50 to 72. When wheat is at 50 shillings a quarter, or 6*s*. 3*d*. a bushel, equal to 150 cents, the duty is 5*s*. 7*d*. or 134 cents per bushel. So that as the point of starvation approaches, we are *permitted* to exchange flour for calico: when foreign flour can be dispensed with, it is excluded. In ordinary seasons, the British duty on American flour is from 70 to 80 per cent. on its cost in the United States.

BRITISH TARIFFS.	As in 1820. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	As in 1828. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	AMERICAN TARIFFS. 1828. $ and cts. &c.	1832. $ & cts. &c.
Alum cwt.	0 17 6	4 20	0 17 6	4 20	2 50 cwt.	same
Antimony, regulus of . . "	2 0 0	9 60	2 0 0	9 60	free.	same
Apples, dried . . . bushel	0 7 0	1 68	0 7 0	1 68	15 per cent.	free
Arms	*prohibited*	———	*prohibited*	———	30 per cent.	same
Aqua fortis . . . cwt.	0 14 3	3 42	0 14 3	3 42	12½ per cent.	same
Ashes, pot and pearl . . "	0 12 0	2 88	0 1 8	40	15 per cent.	same
——— if from British plantations "	0 1 8	40	*free.*		"	
Bacon or hams . . . "	2 16 0	13 44	1 8 0	6 72	3 cts. per lb.	same
Baskets . . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	15 per cent.
Beef	*prohibited*	———	*prohibited*	———	2 cts. per lb.	same
Beer, (in barrels) bbl. of 32 gals.	1 2 2	gal. 16⅔	3 1 1	gal. 46	15 cents gal.	same
Books*	*prohibited*	———	*prohibited*	———	30 cents lb.	same
Bottles, common glass, besides the excise in 1820, p.ct.	80 0 0	80 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	*av.*250cts.gr.	same
Brass manufactures . . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Bricks per 1,000	1 2 6	5 40	1 2 6	5 40	15 per cent.	same
Butter cwt.	1 5 0	6 00	1 0 0	4 80	5 cents lb.	same
Buttons, prohibited till 5th July, 1826.	*prohibited*	———	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Cabinet wares					30 per cent.	same
Cables, tarred or untarred . cwt.	1 1 6	5 16	0 10 9	2 58	*av.* 4½ cts lb.	same
Calicoes	*prohibited*	———	sq. yd. 3½	07	8¾ sq. yard.	same
Candles—tallow . . cwt.	3 3 4	15 20	3 3 4	15 20	5 cents lb.	same
———sperm or wax . lb.	0 2 6	60	0 2 6	60	*av.* 7 cts. lb.	same
Candlewick . . . cwt.	4 8 8	21 28	4 8 8	21 28	37½ per cent.	same
Canes, walking . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Caps, cotton or worsted . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	———	———	50 per cent.	same
Cards, playing . . . dozen	4 0 0	19 00	4 0 0	19 00	30 c. pr. pack	same
Carpets—Turkey, not exceeding 6 ys. sq. each	8 15 0	42 00			70 cts. sq. yd.	63 cts. sq. yd
——— generally (ingrn. &c.) p.ct.	50 0 0	———	———	———	*av.*36 c. sq. yd	35 cts. sq. yd
Carriages of all sorts . . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same
Casks, empty "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Cattle	*prohibited*	———	*prohibited*	———	15 per cent.	same
Chalk, prepared . . . "	40 0 0	40 pr. ct.	40 0 0	40 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	free
China ware, generally . . "	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Cider, (and excise 1820) tun 252 gals.	29 14 6	gal. 56½	21 10 0	gal. 40⅓	15 per cent.	same
Clocks per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Coals ton.	2 0 0	9 60	2 0 0	9 60	6 cents bush.	same
Copper—fit only to be re-manuf. cwt.	1 9 2	7 00	0 15 0	3 60	free.	same
———in plates . . "	3 0 0	14 40	1 10 0	7 20	free.	same
———manufactures . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Copperas, blue or green . cwt.	0 5 0	1 20	0 5 0	1 20	200 cts. cwt.	same
Cordage, tarred or untarred "	1 1 6	5 16	0 10 9	2 58	*av.* 4½ cts. lb.	same
Corks—ready made, . . lb.	0 7 0	1 68	0 7 0	1 68	12 cents lb.	same
Corn—*see preceding page.*						
Cotton manufactures, generally p. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	10 0 0	10 pr. ct.	4⅘ per ct.	42 pr. ct.
——— colored or printed "	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	sq. yd. 3½	7 c.sq.yd		4⅘ pr. ct.
Drugs, generally . . . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	ex.dye stffs.
Earthen ware, generally . "	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	15 0 0	15 pr. ct.	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Embroidery and needle work .	*prohibited*	———	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	12½ per cent.	
Extracts, liquorice, &c. &c. per ct.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Feathers, for beds . . cwt.	4 15 0	22 80	2 4 0	10 56	15 per cent.	same
Fish, generally	*prohibited*	———	*prohibited*		$1 per cwt.	same
Flax cwt.	11 3 6	53 64	0 0 1	02	250 cts. cwt.	free
Flowers, artificial . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Frames for pictures . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Gauze of thread . . "	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	20 per cent.	———
Glass—see bottles					[fect. sq.	
—— for windows not being plate cwt.	4 18 0	23 52	8 6 8	40 00	*av.* 325 c. 100	same
—— manufactures, generally per ct. [besides the excise in 1824.]	80 0 0	80 pr. ct.	20 pr. ct.	20 pr. ct.	20 pr. ct. and [2 cts. lb.	same
Gloves prohib. till 5th July 1826, doz.	*prohibited*	———	0 6 0	1 44	30 per cent.	same†
Glue cwt.	0 12 0	2 88	0 12 0	2 88	5 cents lb.	same
Gunpowder "	3 0 0	14 40	3 0 0	14 40	8 cents lb.	same
[prohibited, except in special cases.]						
Hair seating . . . cwt.					30 per cent.	free
—— manufactures generally . "	———	———	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
—— powder "	9 15 0	46 80	9 15 0	46 80	15 per cent.	same
——— if perfumed . "	13 13 0	65 52	13 13 0	65 52	30 per cent.	15 per cent.
Hams "	2 16 0	13 44	1 8 0	6 72	3 cents lb.	same
Hats of chip or cane, average dozen	1 10 0	7 20	1 10 0	7 20	50 per ct.	30 pr. ct.
—— straw average . "	5 2 0	24 48	5 2 0	24 48	with a mi.	
—— of fur or wool, &c. . each	0 10 6	2 62	0 10 6	2 62	30 per cent.	same
Hemp, dressed . . . cwt.	5 0 0	24 00	4 15 0	22 80	300 cts. cwt.	200 cts. cwt.
——— if undressed from Br. plan. "	0 9 2	2 20	*free.*		———	———
Hides—bull or cow . . each	0 2 6	60	0 2 4	56	free.	same
——— if in a British ship . "	0 0 10	20	0 1 2	28	———	———
——— of tanned or tawed per cent.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same

*Such as have been printed in Great Britain within twenty years, by the high duty, or otherwise.
†If leather, wool or worsted 25 per cent.

BRITISH TARIFFS.	As in 1820. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	As in 1828. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	AMERICAN TARIFFS. 1828. $ and cts. &c.	1832. $ and cts. &c.
Hops cwt.	8 11 0	41 04	8 11 0	41 04	15 per cent.	same
Indigo lb.	0 0 5	10	0 0 4	08	50 per cent.	15 per cent.
Iron—in bars unwrought . ton	7 18 4	38 00	1 10 0	7 20	$22 40 cwt.	18 dolls. ton
———slit or in rods . . cwt.	1 1 6	5 16	0 5 0	1 20	3½ cents lb.	3 cents lb.
———hoops “	1 3 9	5 70	1 3 9	5 70	3½ cents lb.	3 cents lb.
———wire, generally . “	5 18 0	28 32	1 0 0	4 80	*av.* 8 cts. lb.	*av.* 7 cents
———wrought—axes, &c. &c. p. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	35 per cent.	30 per cent.
———wrought (ironmongery) “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
———steel “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	150 cts. cwt.	same
Lace, generally . . . “	40 0 0	40 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Lamp black . . . cwt.	3 6 6	15 96	3 6 6	15 96	15 per cent.	same
Lard “	0 8 0	1 92	0 8 0	1 92	3 cents lb.	same
Lacquered ware . . .			30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Lead, pig per cent.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	t. 2 0 0	9 60	3 cents lb.	same
—— white cwt.	0 10 4	2 48	0 7 0	1 68	5 cents lb.	same
Leather, and all its manuf. pr. ct.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same
Linens, generally prohibitory in 1820					25 per cent.	15 per cent.
——— sail cloth, average 120 ells	7 0 0	33 60	sq. yd. 7½	15	10½ cts. sq. yd	15 per cent.
——— chequer'd or strip'd, &c. p. ct.	172 10 0	172 p. ct.			25 per ct. }	15 per cent.
——— generally, after 5th July, 1828			25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	25 per ct. }	
Matting “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	15 cts. sq. yd.	5 per cent.
Mattresses “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Mercury, prepared . . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Musical instruments . . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same
Molasses cwt.	1 3 9	5 70	1 3 9	5 70	5 cents gal.	same
Mutton	*prohibited*		*prohibited*		15 per cent.	same
Oil—of olives . tun of 252 gals.	16 13 0	79 92	8 8 0	40 32	25 cents gal.	20 cents gal.
——linsced and rape seed, &c. “	33 5 0	159 60	39 18 0	191 52	25 cents gal.	15 per cent.
——castor lb.	0 1 3	30	0 1 0	24	40 cents gal.	free
——train and blubber tun of 252 gals.	33 5 0	159 60	26 12 0	127 60	15 cents gal.	same
—— “ if British caught “	0 5 6	1 32	0 1 0	24		
——spermaceti . . “	34 18 3	167 58	26 12 0	127 60	25 cents gal.	15 per cent.
—— “ if British caught “	0 8 3	1 98	0 1 0	24		
——not otherwise enumerated p. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	12½ per cent.	free
Painters' colors, generally . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	free
Paintings on glass, & £4 per cwt. “	80 0 0	80 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	free
Paper—made of old rope, &c. lb.	0 0 10	20	0 0 3	6	3 cents lb.	same
——— printed or stained sq. yard	0 1 7	38	0 1 0	24	40 per cent.	same
——— other, generally . lb.	0 1 7	38	0 0 9	18	*av.* 15 cts. lb.	same
Parchments dozen	0 10 0	2 40	0 10 0	2 40	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Pasteboards . . . cwt.	3 8 2	16 36	3 8 2	16 36	15 cents lb.	same
Pearl barley . . . “	0 17 6	4 20	0 17 6	4 20	15 per cent.	same
Pencils per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	40 per cent.	25 per cent.
Pens “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Pewter manufactures . .	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Plattings of straw . . lb.	0 17 0	4 08	1 0 0	4 80	50 per ct. }	30 per cent.
——— of chip, cane, &c. . “	0 6 0	1 44	0 17 0	4 08	50 per ct. }	
Pork	*prohibited*		*prohibited*		2 cents lb.	same
Pots, of stone . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Rice cwt.	0 15 0	3 60	0 15 0	3 60	15 per cent.	same
Salt (excise) 56lbs.	1 0 0	4 80	*free.*		10 cts. bush.	same
Sail cloth					10½ cts. sq. yd.	15 per cent.
Sheep	*prohibited*		*prohibited*		15 per cent.	same
Ships (to be broken up) pr. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Skates “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Skins and furs tanned or tawed “	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	75 0 0	75 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same
Slate “	66 10 0	66 pr. ct.	66 10 0	66 pr. ct.	*av.* $6 ton. }	
Slates, in frames . . dozen	0 3 0	72	0 3 0	72	33½ per ct. }	25 per cent.
Snuff, (excise in 1829) . lb.	0 5 0	1 20	0 6 0	1 44	25 cents lb.	same
Soap, hard cwt.	4 10 0	21 60	4 10 0	21 60	4 cents lb.	same
——— soft “	3 11 3	17 10	3 11 3	17 10		
Silk manufactures, generally .	*prohibited*		30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	*av.* 25 per ct.	*av.* 7½ per ct.
Spirits—rum, &c. . . . gal.	0 17 0	4 08	1 10 0	7 20	*av.* 60 per ct.	same
Starch cwt.	9 10 0	45 60	9 10 0	45 60	15 per cent.	same
Stockings, generally . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	*various.*		*av.* 25 per ct.	same
Stones, generally . . “	66 10 0	66 pr. ct.	66 10 0	66 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Stuffs, made of wool . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	15 0 0	15 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	15 per cent.
Sugar—brown . . . cwt.	3 3 0	15 12	3 3 0	15 12	3 cents lb.	2½ cents
——— white or clayed . . “	4 6 8	20 80	3 3 0	15 12	4 cents lb.	3½ cents
——— refined . . . “	8 8 0	40 32	8 8 0	40 32	*av.* 11 cts. lb.	same
——— candy, brown . . “	5 12 0	26 88	5 12 0	26 88	12 cents lb.	same
——— white . . “	8 8 0	40 32	8 8 0	40 32	12 cents lb.	same
Tapes, generally . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	*various.*		25 per cent.	same
Thread, cotton . . . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	10 0 0	10 pr. ct.	37½ per cent.	same
——— packing . . . cwt.	1 10 0	7 20	0 15 0	3 60	5 cents lb.	same
——— generally . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
Tiles, all sorts . . . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	15 per cent.
Tin cwt.	5 9 3	26 22	2 10 0	12 00	free, if plates.	free
Tobacco, unmanufactured . lb.	0 3 0	72	0 3 0	72	15 per cent.	same
Toys per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	20 0 0	20 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	15 per cent.
Turnery, in general . “	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	30 per cent.	same

BRITISH TARIFFS.	As in 1820. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	As in 1828. £ s. d.	Equal to $ cts.	AMERICAN TARIFFS. 1828. $ and cts. &c.	1832. $ and cts. &c.
Twine cwt.	1 11 0	7 44	1 11 0	7 44	5 cents lb.	same
Vellum the skin	0 7 2	1 72	0 7 2	1 72	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Verdegris lb.	0 3 4	80	0 2 0	48	12½ per cent.	same
——— if crystalized, &c. . "	0 6 6	1 56			12½ per cent.	same
Vinegar . . . tun of 225 gals.	61 7 0	gl. 1 31	18 18 0	gl. 40	8 cents gal.	same
Wafers lb.	0 1 3	30	0 1 3	30	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
Washing balls "			0 1 8	40	30 per cent.	same
Watches per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	12½ per cent.	same
Wax—bees, unmanufactured cwt.	3 6 6	15 96	3 6 6	15 96	6 cents lb.	same
——— if manufactured "	6 3 6	29 64	6 3 9	29 70	15 per cent.	same
——— sealing wax . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	30 0 0	30 pr. ct.	15 per cent.	same
Whale fins ton	95 0 0	456 00	95 0 0	456 00	15 per cent.	same
——— if British caught . "	2 7 3	11 34	1 0 0	4 80		
Wire, brass or copper . cwt.	5 14 0	27 36	2 10 0	12 00	25 per cent.	same
——— gilt or plated . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	25 0 0	25 pr. ct.	25 per cent.	same
——— iron, generally . cwt.	5 18 9	28 50	1 0 0	4 80	*av.* 8 cts. lb.	*av.* 7 cts. lb.
——— steel lb.	0 1 10	44	0 1 10	44	*av.* 8 cts. lb.	*av.* 7 cts. lb.
Wood—the duties are gener. prohib. but we shall give a few items.						
———oars . . . the 120	15 8 9	74 10	14 19 3	71 82	30 per cent.	25 per cent.
———if of Br. colonial product, &c. "	0 19 6	4 68	0 19 6	4 68		
———staves, largest size . "	5 14 0	27 36	4 16 0	23 04	15 per cent.	same
———if of Br. colonial product, &c. "	0 2 6	60	0 8 0	1 92		
Wool—sheep's . . . lb.	0 0 6	12	*0 0 0¾	1½	{ 50 per cent. & 4 ct. lb.	{ 40 pr. ct. & 4 cts. lb.†
——— manufactures of . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	15 0 0	15 pr. ct.	{ *av.* about 50 p. ct. *at* the minimums	{ coarse 5 p. cent. other 50 per ct.
——— cotton (wool) . "	12 0 0	12 pr. ct.	6 0 0	6 pr. ct.	3 cents lb.	same
——— of Br. col. product, &c. 100 lb.	0 8 7	2 06	*free.*			
Yarn—cotton lb.	0 1 7	38		10 pr. ct.	37½ per cent.	same
———worsted "	0 1 7	38	0 0 6	12	27½ per cent.	20 per cent.
———wool . . . per cent.	50 0 0	50 pr. ct.	15 0 0	15 pr. ct.	36⅔ per cent.	{ 4 cts. lb. & 50 pr. ct.

*Wool worth less than 1*s*. ½*d*. more than 1*s*.—1*d*.

†But if costing less than 8 cents lb. free.

THE TREASURY BILL.

A bill further altering the duties on imports, and for other purposes, accompanying the secretary of the treasury's report to the house of representatives, of the 27th of April, 1832.

Sec. 1. *Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America, in congress assembled,* That from and after the third day of March, 1833, the act entitled "An act in alteration of the several acts imposing duties on imports," approved the 19th of May, 1828, shall be repealed; except so far as the same may be necessary for the recovery and collection of all duties which shall have accrued under the said act, and for the recovery, collection, distribution, and remission of all fines, penalties and forfeitures, which may have been incurred under the same.

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That in lieu of the duties now imposed by law on the importation of articles hereinafter mentioned, there shall be levied, collected and paid, the following duties, that is to say:

1st. On wool, unmanufactured, the value whereof, at the place of exportation, shall not exceed ten cents per pound, five per cent. ad valorem; and when the value shall exceed ten cents per pound, twenty per cent. ad valorem: *Provided,* That wool imported on the skin shall be estimated, as to weight and value, as other wool.

2d. On manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, not otherwise specified, the value whereof shall not exceed fifty cents a square yard, ten per cent. ad valorem; on worsted stuff goods, and woollen and worsted yarn, twenty per centum; on mits, gloves, bindings, blankets, hosiery, and carpets and carpetings, twenty-five per centum; on flannels and baizes, and all other manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, thirty per centum; and on ready made clothing, fifty per centum.

3d. On all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton shall be a component part, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem: *Provided,* That all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton shall be a component part, not dyed, colored, printed, or stained, shall be valued at thirty cents per square yard, and, if dyed, colored, printed, or stained, shall be valued at thirty-five cents per square yard; and, on nankeens imported direct from China, twenty per cent. ad valorem.

4th. On all stamped, printed, or painted floor cloths, forty-three cents a square yard; on oil cloths, of all kinds other than that usually denominated floor-cloth, and on floor matting, usually made of flags or other materials, thirty per cent. ad valorem.

5th. On iron, in bars or bolts, not manufactured in whole, or in part, by rolling, ninety cents per 112 lbs.

6th. On bar and bolt iron, made wholly, or in part, by rolling, thirty dollars per ton: *Provided,* That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other form less finished than iron in bars or bolts, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, shall be rated as iron in bars or bolts, and pay duty accordingly.

7th. On iron in pigs, fifty cents per 112 lbs.; on vessels of cast iron, not otherwise specified, one and a half cents per lb., on all other castings of iron, not otherwise specified, one cent per lb.

8th. On iron or steel wire, not exceeding number fourteen, 5 cents per lb.; over number fourteen, nine cents per lb.

9th. On round iron, or braziers' rods, of three-sixteenths to eight-sixteenths of an inch diameter, inclusive; and on iron in nail or spike rods, or nail plates, slit, rolled, or hammered; and on iron in sheets, and hoop iron; and on iron slit, rolled or hammered for band iron, scroll iron, or casement rods, three cents per lb.; on iron spikes, four cents per lb.; on iron nails, cut or wrought, five cents per lb.; on tacks, brads and sprigs, not exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, five cents per thousand; exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, five cents per lb.; on square wire, used for the manufacture of stretchers for umbrellas, twelve per cent. ad valorem; on anvils and anchors, and all parts thereof, manufactured in whole or in part, two cents per lb.; on iron cables or chains, or parts thereof, manufactured in whole or in part, three cents per lb. and no drawback shall be allowed on the exportation of iron cables or parts thereof; on mill cranks and mill irons, of wrought iron, four cents per lb.; on mill saws, one dollar each; on blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, two and a half cents per lb.; on muskets, one dollar and fifty cents per stand; on rifles, two dollars and fifty cents each; on all other fire arms, thirty per cent. ad valorem.

10th. On axes, adzes, hatchets, drawing knives, cutting knives, sickles or reaping hooks, scythes, spades, shovels, squares of iron or steel, bridle bits of all descriptions, steelyards and scale beams, socket chissels, vices and screws of iron, called wood screws, thirty per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That said articles shall not be imported at a less rate of duty than would have been chargeable on the material constituting their chief value, if imported in an unmanufactured state.

11th. On steel, one dollar and fifty cents per 112 lbs.

12th. On japanned wares of all kinds, on plated wares of all kinds, and on all manufactures, not otherwise specified, made of brass, iron, steel, pewter, lead, or tin, or of which either of these metals is a component material, a duty of twenty-five per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all articles manufactured, in whole, of sheet, rod, hoop, bolt, or bar iron, or of iron wire, or of which sheet, rod, hoop, bolt, or bar iron, or iron wire, shall constitute the greatest weight, and which are not otherwise specified, shall pay the same duty per lb. that is charged by this act on sheet, rod, hoop, bolt or bar iron, or on iron wire, of the same number respectively: *Provided, also*, That the said last mentioned rates shall not be less than the said duty of twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

13th. That all scrap and old iron, shall pay a duty of twelve dollars and fifty cents per ton; that nothing shall be deemed old iron that has not been in actual use; and all pieces of iron (except old) of more than six inches in length, shall be rated as bar, bolt, rod, or hoop iron, as the case may be, and pay duty accordingly.

14th. On unmanufactured hemp, fifty dollars per ton; on sail duck, ten cents a square yard; and, on cotton bagging, three and a half cents a square yard.

15th. On all manufactures of silk, or of which silk shall be a component part, coming from beyond the Cape of Good Hope, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem; and on all other manufactures of silk, or of which silk shall be a component part, twenty per cent.

16th. On brown sugar and syrup for making sugar, two and a half cents per pound; and on white clayed, or powdered sugar, three and one-third cents per pound.

17th. On salt, five cents per fifty-six pounds.

18th. On coffee, half a cent per pound.

19th. On teas of all kinds imported from China, or other places east of the Cape of Good Hope, and in vessels of the United States, one cent per pound. On all teas imported from any other place, or in vessels other than vessels of the United States, ten cents per pound.

20th. On slates of all kinds, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

21st. On window glass, not above 8 by 10 inches in size, 3 dollars per hundred square feet; not above 10 by 12 inches, 3 dollars and 50 cents per hundred square feet; and if above 10 by 12 inches, four dollars per hundred square feet: *Provided*, That all window glass imported in plates, uncut, shall be charged with the highest rates of duty hereby imposed. On apothecaries' vials, of the capacity of four ounces and less, one dollar per gross; and not exceeding eight ounces, one dollar and twenty-five cents per gross. On all wares of cut glass, not specified, 30 per cent. ad valorem; and on all other articles of glass, not specified, 20 per centum. On paper hangings, 40 per centum. On all Leghorn hats or bonnets, and all hats or bonnets of straw, chip or grass, and all flats, braids or plats, for making hats or bonnets, 30 per cent. On porcelain, China, earthen and stone-wares, of all kinds, 20 per cent. On the following articles, 12½ per cent. ad valorem, viz: whalebone, the product of foreign fishing; raw silk, and dressed furs;—and on the following articles, 25 per cent. ad valorem, viz: cabinet wares; boards; planks; walking canes and sticks; frames or sticks, for umbrellas or parasols; and all manufactures of wood, not otherwise specified; copper vessels, and all manufactures of copper, not otherwise specified; all manufactures of hemp or flax, not otherwise specified; hats and caps of fur, leather, or wool; whips, bridles, saddles and all manufactures of leather, not otherwise specified; manufactures of marble; fans; artificial flowers; ornamental feathers, ornaments for head dresses, caps for women, and millinery of all kinds; comfits, and sweetmeats of all kinds, preserved in sugar or brandy; carriages, and parts of carriages, and umbrellas and parasols, of whatever material made; parchment and vellum; blank books; wafers, and black lead pencils; brushes of all kinds.

22d. On olive oil, in casks, twelve and a half cents a gallon.

23d. On the wines of France, viz. red wines, in casks, six cents a gallon; white wines, in casks, ten cents a gallon; and wines of all sorts, in bottles, twenty-two cents a gallon.

24th. On the following articles, an ad valorem duty of fifteen per cent. viz: barley; grass, or straw baskets; composition wax, or amber beads; all other beads not otherwise enumerated; lamp black; shell, or paper boxes; hair bracelets; hair, not made up for head dresses; bricks; paving tiles; brooms of hair, or palm leaf; Cashmere of Thibet, down of all kinds; feathers, for beds; palm leaf, or palmetto hats.

25th. All articles, not herein specified either as free, or as liable to a different duty, and which, by the existing laws, pay a higher duty than fifteen per cent. to pay an ad valorem duty of fifteen per cent. from, and after, the said 3d day of March, 1833.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That, in addition to the articles exempted from duty by the existing laws, the following articles imported from, and after the third day of March, 1833, shall be exempted from duty, that is to say: cocoa; almonds; currants; prunes; figs; raisins, in jars and boxes; raisins, all other; black pepper; ginger; mace; nutmegs; cinnamon; cassia; cloves; pimento; camphor; corks; crude salt-petre; side-arms: say—cutlasses,

daggers, dirks, swords, hangers; flax unmanufactured; quicksilver; opium; quills, prepared; tin, in plates and sheets; brass, in plates; marble; hair cloth and seatings; blue vitriol; argol; gum Arabic; gum Senegal; epaulettes, of gold and silver; sac dye; madder; madder root; nut and berries, used in dyeing; sumach; saffron; turmeric; woad, or pastel; aloes; ambergris; Burgundy pitch; bark Peruvian; cochineal; capers; calomel; camomile flowers; coriander seed; cantharides castanas; catsup; chalk; coculus indicus; coral; corrosive sublimate; dates; filberts; filtering stones; frankincense; grapes; gamboge; hemlocks; henbane; hones; horn-plates, for lanthorns; ox horns; other horns, and tips; India rubber; ipecacuanha; ivory, unmanufactured; ivory black; juniper berries; maccaroni; mill stones; musk; nuts, of all kinds; olives; oil of juniper; paintings and drawings; rattans, unmanufactured; reeds, unmanufactured; rhubarb; rotten stone; tamarinds; tortoise shells; tin foil; shellac; sponges; sago; spy-glasses; telescopes; sextants; quadrants; hair pencils; Brazil paste; tartar, crude; vegetables, such as are used principally in dyeing and in composing dyes; weld, and all articles used principally for dyeing, coming under the duty of twelve and a half per cent. all other dyeing drugs, and materials for composing dyes; all other medicinal drugs, and all articles *not enumerated* in this act, nor the existing laws, and which are now liable to an ad valorem duty of fifteen per cent.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the 3d day of March, aforesaid, so much of any act of congress as requires the addition of 10 or 20 per cent. to the cost, or value of any goods, wares or merchandise, in estimating the duty thereon, or as imposes any duty on such addition, shall be repealed.

Sec. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the 3d day of March, aforesaid, where the amount of duty on merchandise, (except manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part), imported into the United States, in any ship or vessel, on account of one person only, or of several persons jointly interested, shall not exceed two hundred dollars, the same shall be paid in cash, without discount; and if it shall exceed that sum, shall, at the option of the importer, or importers, be paid, or secured to be paid, in the manner now required by law, one half in three and one half in six calendar months; and that, from and after the said 3d day of March, so much of the 62d section of the act, entitled "an act to regulate the collection of duties on imports and tonnage," approved the 2nd of March, 1799, as authorises the deposite of teas, under the bond of the importer, or importers, shall be repealed.

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the 3d day of March, aforesaid, the duties on all manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, shall be paid in cash, without discount, or, at the option of the importer, be placed in the public stores, under bond at his risk, subject to the payment of the customary storages and charges, and to the payment of interest at the rate of six per centum per annum while so stored: *Provided*, That the duty on the articles so stored shall be paid one half in three and one half in six months from the date of importation: *Provided, also*, That if any instalment of duties be not paid when the same shall have become due, so much of the said merchandise as may be necessary to discharge such instalment shall be sold at public auction, and, retaining the sum necessary for the payment of such instalment of the duties, together with the expenses of the safe keeping and sale of such goods, the overplus, if any, shall be returned by the collector to the importer, or owner, or to his agent or lawful representative: *And, provided, also*, That the importer, owner, or consignee of such goods may, at any time after the deposite shall have been made, withdraw, the whole, or any part thereof, on paying the duties on what may be withdrawn, and the customary storage and charges, and of interest.

Sec. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the 3d day of March, aforesaid, foreign manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, which may be sold at public sale, other than sales under execution, decrees, and process of courts in the United States, there shall be reserved by the seller, one and a half per cent. on the amount of such sale for the use of the United States; and no such sale shall be made but in the presence of an officer of the customs, in places where there shall be one, for which purpose reasonable notice shall be given to the collector of the district, or such officer of the customs as he may designate for that service; and an account of the merchandise sold, certified, and approved by the officer of the customs present, shall be rendered by the seller to the collector, the said one and a half per cent. paid over to him within twenty-four hours after such sale. And if any person shall make such sale without the presence of an officer of the customs, or shall fail to render such account within the time required, he shall forfeit and pay to the United States two hundred dollars; or if he shall fail to pay over to the collector as is hereby required, the one and a half per cent. accruing to the United States on such sale, he shall forfeit and pay to the United States, double the amount of such per centage.

Sec. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That, in all cases where the duty which now is, or hereafter may be, imposed on any goods, wares or merchandises, imported into the United States, shall, by law, be regulated by, or be directed to be estimated or levied upon the value of the square yard, or of any other quantity or parcel thereof; and in all cases where there is or shall be imposed any ad valorem rate of duty on any goods, wares or merchandise, imported into the United States, it shall be the duty of the collector within whose district the same shall be imported or entered, to cause the actual value thereof, at the tim

purchased, and place from which the same shall have been imported into the United States, to be appraised, estimated and ascertained, and the number of such yards, parcels or quantities, and such actual value of every of them, as the case may require: And it shall, in every such case, be the duty of the appraisers of the United States, and every of them, and of every other person who shall act as such appraiser, by all the reasonable ways or means in his or their power, to ascertain, estimate, and appraise the true and actual value, any invoice or affidavit thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, of the said goods, wares and merchandise, at the time purchased, and place from whence the same shall have been imported into the United States, and the number of such yards, parcels or quantities, and such actual value of every of them, as the case may require; and all such goods, wares and merchandises, being manufactures of wool, or whereof wool shall be a component part, which shall be imported into the United States in an unfinished condition, shall, in every such appraisal, be taken, deemed and estimated by the said appraisers, and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, to have been, at the time purchased, and place from whence the same were imported into the United States, of as great actual value as if the same had been entirely finished: *Provided*, That, in all cases where any goods, wares or merchandise, subject to ad valorem duty, or whereon the duty is or shall be by law regulated by, or be directed to be estimated or levied upon, the value of the square yard, or any other quantity or parcel thereof, shall have been imported into the United States from a country other than that in which the same were manufactured or produced, the appraisers shall value the same at the current value thereof at the time of purchase, before such last exportation to the United States, in the country were the same may have been originally manufactured or produced.

Sec. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be lawful for the appraisers to call before them, and examine upon oath, any owner, importer, consignee, or other person, touching any matter or thing which they may deem material, in ascertaining the true value of any merchandise imported, and to require the production, on oath, of any letters, accounts, or invoices in his possession, relating to the same; for which purpose they are hereby authorised to administer oaths: and if any person so called, shall fail to attend, or shall decline to answer, or to produce such papers when so required, he shall forfeit and pay to the United States fifty dollars, and if such person be the owner, importer or consignee, the appraisement which the said appraisers may make of the goods, wares or merchandise, shall be final and conclusive, any act of congress to the contrary notwithstanding. And any person who shall swear falsely on such examination, shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and if he be the owner, importer, or consignee, the merchandise shall be forfeited.

Sec. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury, under the direction of the president of the United States, from time to time, to establish such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, as the president of the United States shall think proper, to secure a just, faithful and impartial appraisal of all goods, wares and merchandise, as aforesaid, imported into the United States, and just and proper entries of such actual value thereof, and of the square yards, parcels or other quantities thereof, as the case may require, and of such actual value of every of them; and it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury to report all such rules and regulations, with the reasons therefor, to the then next session of congress.

Sec. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That from and after the third day of March, aforesaid, in consideration of the duties imposed on the several articles used in the construction and fitting of ships and vessels, there be allowed a drawback at the rate of two dollars per ton on registered vessels; of one dollar and twenty-five cents per ton on enrolled and licensed vessels, except steamboats, and fifty cents per ton on steamboats: such drawbacks to be paid, as the case may be, to the owners of enrolled and licensed vessels on the taking out of the enrollment and license for the first time, if such vessels shall not have been previously registered; and to the owners of registered vessels in clearing, for the first time, for a foreign port or place, other than an adjoining state or territory, or the West Indies: *Provided*, That such vessels shall not have been previously enrolled and licensed; and in case registered vessels not previously enrolled and licensed shall, in the first instance, clear out for a foreign port or place, in an adjoining state or territory, or the West Indies, then the drawback to such vessel is only to be at the rate of one dollar and twenty-five cents per ton.

Sec. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That an addition of ten per centum shall be made to the several rates of duties by this act imposed, in respect to all goods, wares and merchandise, on the importation of which, in American or foreign vessels, a specific discrimination has not already been made, which, from and after the 3d day of March aforesaid, shall be imported in ships or vessels of the United States: *Provided*, That this additional duty shall not apply to goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported after said day in ships or vessels not of the United States, entitled by treaty, or by an act or acts of congress, to be entered in the ports of the United States, on the payment of the same duties as shall then be paid on goods, wares and merchandise, imported in ships or vessels of the United States.

Sec. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That there shall be allowed a drawback of the duties by this act imposed, on goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported from and after the said 3d day of March, upon the exportation thereof within the time, and in the manner prescribed, in the existing laws at the time.

Sec. 14. *And be it further enacted*, That the existing laws at the time shall extend to, and be in force for the collection of the duties imposed by this act, on goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported into the United States from and after the said 3d day of March; and for the recovery, collection, distribution and remission of fines, penalties and forfeitures, and for the allowance of drawbacks by this act authorised, and fully and effectually as if every regulation, restriction, penalty, forfeiture, provision, clause, matter and thing, in the then existing laws contained, had been inserted in, and re-enacted by this act. And that so much of any act which is contrary to this act, shall be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever goods composed wholly, or in part, of wool or cotton, of similar kind, but different quality, are found in the same packages charged at an average price, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in such package, and so charged as the average value of the whole; and that so much of the act, entitled "an act for the more effectual collection of the impost duties," approved the 28th of May, 1830, as requires the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in a package as the average value of the whole, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 16. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever, upon the opening and examination of any package or packages of imported goods, composed wholly or in part of wool or cotton, in the manner provided by the fourth section of the act for the more effectual collection of impost duties, approved on the 28th day of May, 1830, the said goods shall be found not to correspond with the entry thereof at the custom house; and if any package shall be found to contain any article not entered, such article shall be forfeited; or if the package be made up with intent to evade or defraud the revenue, the package shall be forfeited; and so much of the said section as prescribes a forfeiture of goods found not to correspond with the invoice thereof, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 17. *And be it further enacted*, That from and after the said 3d day of March, 1833, the ad valorem rates of duty on goods, wares and merchandise, shall be estimated in the manner following: to the actual cost, if the same shall have been actually purchased, or the actual value, if the same shall have been procured otherwise than by purchase, at the time and place when and where purchased or otherwise procured; or to the appraised value, if appraised, shall be added all charges, except insurance, from the foreign port of exportation to the United States.

THE NEW TARIFF LAW.

An act to alter and amend the several acts imposing duties on Imports.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America, in congress assembled, That from and after the 3d day of March, 1833, so much of the act entitled "an act in alteration of the several acts imposing duties on imports," approved the 19th May, 1828, as is herein otherwise provided for, shall be repealed, except so far as the same may be necessary for the recovery and collection of all duties which shall have accrued under the said act, and for the recovery, collection, distribution, and remission of all fines, penalties and forfeitures, which may have been incurred under the same.

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That from and after the 3d day of March 1833, in lieu of the duties now imposed by law on the importation of the articles hereinafter mentioned, there shall be levied, collected and paid, the following duties, that is to say:

1st. Wool, unmanufactured, the value whereof, at the place of exportation, shall not exceed eight cents per pound, shall be imported free of duty, and if any wool so imported shall be fine wool mixed with dirt or other material, and thus reduced in value to eight cents per pound, or under, the appraisers shall appraise said wool at such price as in their opinion it would have cost had it not been so mixed, and a duty thereon shall be charged in conformity with such appraisal; on wool, unmanufactured, the value whereof, at the place of exportation, shall exceed eight cents, shall be levied four cents per pound, and forty per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, that wool imported on the skin, shall be estimated, as to weight and value, as other wool.

2d. On all milled and fulled cloth, known by the name of plains, kerseys, or kendal cottons, of which wool shall be the only material, and the value whereof shall not exceed thirty-five cents a square yard, five per cent. ad valorem; on worsted stuff goods, shawls, and other manufactures of silk and worsted, ten per centum ad valorem: on worsted yarn twenty per centum ad valorem; on woollen yarn, four cents per pound and fifty per cent. ad valorem; on mits, gloves, bindings, blankets, hosiery, and carpets and carpeting, twenty-five per cent., except Brussels, Wilton and treble ingrain carpeting, which shall be at sixty-three cents the square yard, all other igrained and Venitian carpeting thirty-five cents the square yard; and, except blankets, the value whereof, at the place from whence exported, shall not exceed seventy-five cents each, the duty to be levied upon which, shall be five per cent. ad valorem; on flannels, bockings and baizes, sixteen cents the square yard; on coach laces, thirty-five per cent.; and upon merino shawls made of wool, all other manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, and on ready made clothing, fifty per centum ad valorem.

3d. On all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton shall be a component part, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem, excepting cotton twist, yarn and thread, which shall remain at the rate of duty fixed by the act to amend the several acts imposing duties on imports, of 22d May, 1824: *And, provided*, That all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton shall be a component part, not dyed, colored, printed, or stained, not exceeding in value thirty cents the square yard, shall be valued at thirty cents per square yard, and if dyed, colored, printed, or stained, in whole or in part, not exceeding in value thirty-five cents the square yard, shall be valued at thirty-five cents per square yard; and on nankeens, imported direct from China, twenty per cent. ad valorem.

4th. On all stamped, printed, or painted floor cloths, forty-three cents a square yard; on oil cloths of all kinds, other than that usually denominated patent floor cloth, twelve and a half cents the square yard; and on floor matting, usually made of flags or other materials, five per cent. ad valorem.

5th. On iron, in bars or bolts, not manufactured in whole or in part by rolling, ninety cents per one hundred and twelve pounds.

6th. On bar and bolt iron made wholly or in part by rolling, thirty dollars per ton: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, or other form less finished than iron in bars or bolts, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, shall be rated as iron in bars or bolts, and pay duty accordingly.

7th. On iron in pigs, fifty cents per one hundred and twelve pounds; on vessels of cast iron, not otherwise specified, one and a half cents per pound; on all other castings of iron, not otherwise specified, one cent per pound.

8th. On iron or steel wire not exceeding No. 14, five cents per pound, exceeding No. 14, nine cents per pound; on silvered or plated wire, five per cent. ad valorem, on cap or bonnet wire covered with silk, cotton, flaxen yarn or thread, manufactured abroad, twelve cents per pound.

9th. On round iron or braziers' rods of three-sixteenths to eight-sixteenths of an inch diameter, inclusive, and on iron in nail or spike rods, or nail plates, slit, rolled, or hammered, and on iron in sheets, and hoop iron, and on iron slit, rolled, or hammered for band iron, scroll iron, or casement rods, three cents per pound; on iron spikes, four cents per pound; on iron nails, cut or wrought, five cents per pound; on tacks, brads and sprigs, not exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, five cents per pound—exceeding sixteen ounces to the thousand, five cents per pound; on square wire used for the manufacture of stretchers for umbrellas, and cut in pieces not exceeding the length used therefor, twelve per cent. ad valorem; on anvils and anchors, and all parts thereof, manufactured in whole or in part, two cents per pound; on iron cables or chains, or parts thereof, manufactured in whole or in part, three cents per pound, and no drawback shall be allowed on the exportation of iron cables or parts thereof; on mill cranks and mill irons of wrought iron, four cents per pound; on mill saws, one dollar each; on blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, two and half cents per pound; on muskets, one dollar and fifty cents per stand; on rifles, two dollars and fifty cents each; on all other fire arms, thirty per cent. ad valorem.

10th. On axes, adzes, hatchets, drawing knives, cutting knives, sickles, or reaping hooks, scythes, spades, shovels, squares of iron or steel, plated, brass and polished steel saddlery, coach and harness furniture, of all descriptions, steelyards and scalebeams, socket chissels, vices and screws of iron, called wood screws, thirty per cent. ad valorem; on common tinned and japanned saddlery of all descriptions, ten per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That said articles shall not be imported at a less rate of duty than would have been chargeable on the material constituting their chief value, if imported in an unmanufactured state.

11th. On steel, one dollar and fifty cents per one hundred and twelve pounds.

12th. On japanned wares of all kinds, on plated wares of all kinds, and on all manufactures, not otherwise specified, made of brass, iron, steel, pewter or tin, or of which either of these metals is a component material, a duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all articles manufactured, in whole, of sheet, rod, hoop, bolt, or bar iron, or of iron wire, or of which sheet, rod, hoop, bolt, or bar iron, or iron wire, shall constitute the greatest weight, and which are not otherwise specified, shall pay the same duty per pound that is charged by this act on sheet, rod, hoop, bolt, or bar iron, or on iron wire, of the same number respectively: *Provided, also*, That the said last mentioned rates shall not be less than the said duty of twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

13th. That all scrap and old iron shall pay a duty of twelve dollars and fifty cents per ton; that nothing shall be deemed old iron that has not been in actual use, and fit only to be manufactured; and all pieces of iron, except old, of more than six inches in length, or of sufficient length to be made into spikes and bolts, shall be rated as bar, bolt, rod, or hoop iron, as the case may be, and pay duty accordingly; all manufactures of iron, partly finished, shall pay the same rates of duty as if entirely finished; all vessels of cast iron, and all castings of iron, with handles, rings, hoops or other addition of wrought iron, shall pay the same rates of duty as if made entirely of cast iron.

14th. On unmanufactured hemp forty dollars per ton; sail duck, fifteen per cent. ad valorem, and on cotton bagging, three and a half cents a square yard, without regard to the weight or width of the article: on felt or hat bodies made, or in part of wool, eighteen cents each.

15th. On all manufactures of silk, or of which silk shall be a component part, coming from beyond the Cape of Good Hope, ten per cent. ad valorem, and on all other manufactures of silk, or of which silk is a component part, five per centum ad valorem, except sewing silk, which shall be forty per cent. ad valorem.

16th. On brown sugar and syrup of sugar cane, in casks, two and a half cents per pound; and on white clayed sugar, three and one-third cents per pound.

17th. On salt, ten cents per fifty-six pounds.

18th. On old and scrap lead two cents per pound.

19th. On teas of all kinds imported from places this side the Cape of Good Hope, or in vessels, other than these of the United States, ten cents per pound.

20th. On slates of all kinds, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

21st. On window glass, not above 8 by 10 inches in size, three dollars per hundred square feet; not above 10 by 12 inches, three dollars and fifty cents per hundred square feet; and if above 10 by 12 inches, four dollars per hundred square feet: *Provided*, That all window glass imported in plates, uncut, shall be charged with the highest rates of duty hereby imposed. On all apothecaries' vials and bottles exceeding the capacity of six and not exceeding the capacity of sixteen ounces each, two dollars and twenty-five cents the gross; all perfumery and fancy vials and bottles, not exceeding the capacity of four ounces each, two dollars and fifty cents the gross; and those exceeding four ounces, and not exceeding sixteen ounces each, three dollars and twenty-five cents the gross; on all wares of cut glass not specified, three cents per pound, and thirty per cent. ad valorem; on black glass bottles not exceeding one quart, two dollars per gross; on black glass bottles exceeding one quart, two dollars and fifty cents per gross; on demijohns, twenty-five cents each; and on all other arti-

cles of glass, not specified, two cents per pound, and twenty per cent.; on paper hangings, forty per cent.; on all Leghorn hats or bonnets, and all hats or bonnets of straw, chip, or grass, and all flats, braids, or plaits for making hats or bonnets, thirty per cent.; on the following articles twelve and a half per cent. ad valorem, viz: whalebone, the product of foreign fishing, raw silk, and dressed furs; and on the following articles twenty-five per cent. ad valorem, viz: boards, planks, walking canes and sticks, frames or sticks for umbrellas and parasols, and all manufactures of wood not otherwise specified, copper vessels and all manufactures of copper, not otherwise specified; all manufactures of hemp or flax, except yarn and cordage, tarred and untarred, ticklenburgs, osnaburghs and burlaps, not otherwise specified; fans, artificial flowers, ornamental feathers, ornaments for head dresses, caps for women, and millinery of all kinds, comfits and sweetmeats of all kinds, preserved in sugar or brandy; umbrellas and parasols, of whatever materials made; parchment and vellum, wafers, and black lead pencils, and brushes of all kinds. And on the following articles thirty per cent. ad valorem, viz: cabinet wares, hats and caps of fur, leather or wool; leather; whips, bridles, saddles, and on all manufactures of leather, not otherwise specified; carriages and parts of carriages, and blank books; on boots and bootees, one dollar and fifty cents per pair; shoes of leather; other shoes and slippers of prunella, stuff, or nankeen; also, porcelain, china, stone and earthen ware; musical instruments, and manufactures of marble, shall pay the present rates of duties.

22d. On olive oil, in casks, twenty cents a gallon.

23d. On the wines of France, viz: red wines, in casks, six cents a gallon; white wines, in casks, ten cents a gallon; and French wines of all sorts, in bottles, twenty-two cents a gallon; until the third day of March, eighteen hundred and thirty-four; and from and after that day one-half of those rates respectively; and on all wines other than those of France, one-half of their present rates of duty, respectively, from and after the day last aforesaid: *Provided*, That no higher duty shall be charged under this act, or any existing law on the red wines of Austria than are now, or may be, by this act levied upon red wines of Spain when the said wines are imported in casks.

24th. On the following articles, an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent., viz: barley, grass or straw baskets, composition wax or amber beads, and all other beads not otherwise enumerated; lamp black; indigo, bleached and unbleached linens; shell or paper boxes, hair bracelets, hair not made up for head dresses, bricks, paving tiles, brooms of hair or palm leaf, Cashmere of Thibet, down of all kinds, feathers for beds.

25th. All articles not herein specified, either as free or as liable to a different duty, and which, by the existing laws, pay an ad valorem duty higher than 15 per cent., to pay an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent. from and after the said 3d day of March, 1833.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That, in addition to the articles exempted from duty by the existing laws, the following articles, imported from and after the 3d day of March, 1833, shall be exempted from duty, that is to say: teas of all kinds imported from China or other places east of the Cape of Good Hope, and in vessels of the United States, coffee, cocoa, almonds, currants, prunes, figs, raisins in jars and boxes, all other raisins, black pepper, ginger, mace nutmegs, cinnamon, cassia, cloves, pimento, camphor, crude saltpetre, flax unmanufactured, quicksilver, opium, quills unprepared, tin in plates and sheets, unmanufactured marble, argol, gum Arabic, gum Senegal, epaulettes of gold and silver, lac dye, madder, madder root, nuts and berries used in dyeing, saffron, turmeric, woad or pastel, aloes, ambergris, Burgundy pitch, bark Peruvian, cochineal, capers, camomile flowers, coriander seed, cantharides, castanos, catsup, chalk, coculus indicus, coral, dates, filberts, filtering stones, frankincense, grapes, gamboge, hemlock, henbane, horn plates for lanthorns, ox horns, other horns and tips, India rubber, ipecacuanha, ivory unmanufactured, juniper berries, musk, nuts of all kinds, olives, oil of juniper, paintings and drawings, rattans unmanufactured, reeds unmanufactured, rhubarb, rotten stone, tamarinds, tortise shell, tin foil, shellac, sponges, sago, lemons, limes, pine apples, cocoa nuts and shells, iris or orris root, arrow root, bole ammoniac, colombo root, annotto, anise-seed, oil of anise-seed, oil of cloves, cummin seed, sarsaparilla, balsam tolu, asafœtida, ava root, alcornoque, canella alba, cascarilla, haerlem oil, hartshorn, manna, senna, tapioca, vanilla beans, oil of almonds, nux vomica, amber, platina, busts of marble, metal or plaster, casts of bronze or plaster, strings of musical instruments, flints, kelp, Kermes, pins, needles, mother of pearl, hair unmanufactured; hair pencils, Brazil paste, tarter, crude, vegetables, such as are used principally in dying and in composing dyes, weld, and all articles used principally for dying, coming under the duty of twelve and a half per centum, except bichromate of potash, prussiate of potash, chromate of potash, and nitrate of lead, aquafortis, and tartaric acids: all other dying drugs, and materials for composing dyes, all other medicinal drugs, and all articles not enumerated in this act nor the existing laws, and which are now liable to an ad valorem, duty of fifteen per cent. except tarter emetic and Rochelle salts, sulphate of quinine, calomel and corrosive sublimate, sulphate of magnesia, glauber salts: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to reduce the duties upon allum, copperas, manganese, muriatic or sulphuric acids, refined salt petre, blue vitriol, carbonate of soda, red lead, white lead or litharge, sugar of lead or combs.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That from and after the third day of March aforesaid, so much of any act of congress as requires the addition of ten or twenty per cent. to the

cost or value of any goods, wares or merchandise, in estimating the duty thereon, or as imposes any duty on such addition, shall be repealed.

Sec. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the third day of March aforesaid, where the amount of duty on merchandise, except wool, manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, imported into the United States, in any ship or vessel, on account of one person only, or of several persons jointly interested, shall not exceed two hundred dollars, the same shall be paid in cash, without discount; and if it shall exceed that sum, shall, at the option of the importer or importers, be paid or secured to be paid, in the manner now required by law, one-half in three, and one-half in six calendar months; and that, from and after the said third day of March, so much of the sixty-second section of the act entitled "an act to regulate the collection of duties on imports and tonnage," approved the 2d day of March, 1799, as authorises the deposite of teas under the bond of the importer or importers, shall be repealed. And that so much of any existing law as requires teas, when imported in vessels of the United States, from places beyond the Cape of Good Hope, to be weighed, marked and certified, shall be and the same is hereby repealed.

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the third day of March aforesaid, the duties on all wool, manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, shall be paid in cash, without discount, or, at the option of the importer, be placed in the public stores, under bond, at his risk, subject to the payment of the customary storage and charges, and to the payment of interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum while so stored: *Provided*, That the duty on the articles so stored shall be paid one half in three, and one half in six months from the date of importation: *Provided, also*, That if any instalment of duties be not paid when the same shall have become due, so much of the said merchandise as may be necessary to discharge such instalment shall be sold at public auction, and retaining the sum necessary for the payment of such instalment of the duties together with the expenses of safe keeping and sale of such goods, the overplus, if any, shall be returned by the collector to the importer or owner, or to his agent or lawful representative: *And provided, also*, That the importer, owner, or consignee of such goods, may, at any time after the deposite shall have been made, withdraw the whole or any part thereof, on paying the duties on what may be withdrawn, and the customary storage and charges, and of interest.

Sec. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That, in all cases where the duty which now is, or hereafter may be imposed on any goods, wares or merchandise, imported into the United States, shall, by law, be regulated by, or be directed to be estimated or levied upon, the value of the square yard, or of any other quantity or parcel thereof; and in all cases where there is or shall be imposed any ad valorem rate of duty on any goods, wares, or merchandise, imported into the United States, it shall be the duty of the collector within whose district the same shall be imported or entered, to cause the actual value thereof, at the time purchased, and place from which the same shall have been imported into the United States, to be appraised, estimated and ascertained, and the number of such yards, parcels, or quantities, and such actual value of every of them, as the case may require: and it shall, in every such case, be the duty of the appraisers of the United States, and every of them, and of every other person who shall act as such appraiser, by all the reasonable ways or means in his or their power, to ascertain, estimate and appraise the true and actual value, any invoice or affidavit thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, of the said goods, wares and merchandise, at the time purchased, and place from whence the same shall have been imported into the United States, and the number of such yards, parcels, or quantities, and such actual value of every of them, as the case may require; and all such goods, wares and merchandises, being manufactures of wool, or whereof wool shall be a component part, which shall be imported into the United States in an unfinished condition, shall, in every such appraisal, be taken, deemed and estimated by the said appraisers, and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, to have been, at the time purchased, and place from whence the same were imported into the United States, of as great actual value as if the same had been entirely finished: *Provided*, That in all cases where any goods, wares or merchandise, subject to ad valorem duty, or whereon the duty is or shall be by law regulated by, or be directed to be estimated or levied upon, the value of the square yard, or any other quantity or parcel thereof, shall have been imported into the United States from a country other than that in which the same were manufactured or produced, the appraisers shall value the same at the current value thereof at the time of purchase, before such last exportation to the U. States, in the country where the same may have been originally manufactured or produced.

Sec. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be lawful for the appraisers to call before them, and examine upon oath, any owner, importer, consignee, or other person, touching any matter or thing which they may deem material, in ascertaining the true value of any merchandise imported, and to require the production, on oath, to the collector, or to any permanent appraiser, of any letters, accounts or invoices, in his possession, relating to the same; for which purpose they are hereby authorised to administer oaths. And if any person so called, shall fail to attend, or shall decline to answer or to produce such papers when so required, he shall forfeit and pay to the United States, fifty dollars; and if such person be the owner, importer or consignee, the appraisement which the said appraisers may make of the goods, wares or merchandise, shall be final and conclusive, any act of congress to the contrary notwithstanding. And any person who shall swear falsely on such examination, shall

be deemed guilty of perjury, and if he be the owner, importer, or consignee, the merchandise shall be forfeited.

Sec. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury, under the direction of the president of the United States, from time to time, to establish rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the U. States, as the president of the United States shall think proper, to secure a just, faithful and impartial appraisal of all goods, wares and merchandise, as aforesaid, imported into the United States, and just and proper entries of such actual value thereof, and of the square yards, parcels, or other quantities, as the case may require, and of such actual value of every of them; and it shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury to report all such rules and regulations, with the reasons therefor, to the then next session of congress.

Sec. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That an addition of ten per centum shall be made to the several rates of duties by this act imposed, in respect to all goods, wares and merchandise, on the importation of which, in American or foreign vessels, a specific discrimination has not already been made, which, from and after the third day of March, aforesaid, shall be imported in ships or vessels not of the United States: *Provided*, That this additional duty shall not apply to goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported after said day in ships or vessels not of the United States, entitled by treaty or by an act or acts of congress, to be entered in the ports of the United States, on the payment of the same duties as shall then be paid on goods, wares and merchandise, imported in ships or vessels of the United States.

Sec. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That there shall be allowed a drawback of the duties by this act imposed, on goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported from and after the said third day of March, upon the exportation thereof, within the time, and in the manner prescribed in the existing laws at the time: *Provided*, No drawback shall be allowed on a less quantity of cordage than five tons.

Sec. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That the existing laws at the time shall extend to, and be in force for the collection of the duties imposed by this act, on goods, wares and merchandise, which shall be imported into the U. States from and after the said third day of March; and for the recovery, collection, distribution and remission of all fines, penalties and forfeitures, and for the allowance of drawbacks by this act authorised, as fully and effectually as if every regulation, restriction, penalty, forfeiture, provision, clause, matter and thing, in the then existing laws contained had been inserted in, and re-enacted by this act. And that so much of any act which is contrary to this act, shall be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever goods composed wholly, or in part, of wool or cotton, of similar kind, but different quality, are found in the same packages charged at an average price, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in such package, and so charged as the average value of the whole; and that so much of the act entitled "an act for the more effectual collection of the impost duties," approved the 28th May, 1830, as requires the appraisers to adopt the value of the best article contained in a package as the average value of the whole, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 14. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever, upon the opening and examination of any package or packages of imported goods, composed wholly or in part, of wool or cotton, in the manner provided by the fourth section of the act for the more effectual collection of the impost duties, approved on the 28th day of May, 1830, the said goods shall be found not to correspond with the entry thereof at the custom house; and, if any package shall be found to contain any article not entered, such article shall be forfeited; or, if the package be made up with intent to evade or defraud the revenue, the package shall be forfeited; and so much of the said section as prescribes a forfeiture of goods found not to correspond with the invoice thereof, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Sec. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the said 3d day of March, 1833, the ad valorem rates of duty on goods, wares and merchandise, shall be estimated in the manner following: To the actual cost, if the same shall have been actually purchased, or the actual value, if the same shall have been procured otherwise than by purchase, at the time and place when and where purchased or otherwise procured; or to the appraised value, if appraised, shall be added all charges, except insurance.

Sec. 16. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the said 3d day of March, 1833, in calculating the rates of duties, the pound sterling shall be considered and taken as of the value of four dollars and eighty cents.

Sec. 17. *And be it further enacted*, That syrup imported in casks, and all syrup for making sugar, shall be rated by weight, and pay the same duty as the sugar of which it is composed would pay in its natural state; and that loaf or lump sugar, when imported in a pulverised, liquid or other form, shall pay the same duty as imposed by law on loaf or lump sugar; and all fossil and crude mineral salt shall pay fifteen per centum ad valorem.

Sec. 18. *And be it further enacted*, That the several articles enumerated in this bill, whether imported before or after the passage thereof, may be put into the custom-house stores, under the bond of the importer or owner; and such of said articles as shall remain under the control of the proper officer of the customs on the third day of March, eighteen hun-

dred and thirty-three, shall be subject to no other duty than if the same were imported, respectively, after that day. And if the duties or any part thereof on the articles deposited as aforesaid shall have been paid previous to the said third day of March, the amount so paid shall be refunded to the person importing and depositing the said articles. *Provided*, That this section shall apply to merchandise in original packages which may have been entered and taken into the possession of the importer or owner; upon condition that the said merchandise be placed under the custody of the proper officer of the customs, and that the same shall remain under his control on the third day of March next: *And provided further*, That the secretary of the treasury be authorised to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry this section into effect.

A. STEVENSON,
speaker of the house of representatives.

LITT'N W. TAZEWELL,
president of the senate pro tempore,

Approved, July 14, 1832.

ANDREW JACKSON.

☞The Permanent Committee would long ago have issued the preceding reports, &c. in the present form, had they not expected certain additional papers of value, and revised copies of one or two reports, which, in their opinion, and in pursuance of the duty imposed on them, they could not regard as coming up to the views of the convention. But these papers have not been received, and there is no reason, now, to hope that they will be; hence the little volume is closed.

It may be proper to add, that, of some of the reports, very large editions were printed, and distributed, "far and wide," among the people; and especially in those parts of the United States in which it was thought they would be most useful; and that the members of congress, and other persons in office, were liberally supplied with files of the reports as they were severally issued from the press.

For the committee.

H. NILES, *chairman.*

Baltimore, September 1, 1832.